



Edwards, Arthur David (1982) *An exegesis of Ephesians 2:14-17*. PhD thesis.

<http://theses.gla.ac.uk/5110/>

Copyright and moral rights for this thesis are retained by the author

A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge

This thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the Author

The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the Author

When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given

AN EXEGESIS OF EPHESIANS 2:14-17

Arthur David Edwards

Ph.D.

University of Glasgow
Faculty of Divinity
(New Testament)

March 1982

BEST COPY

AVAILABLE

Variable print quality

Gratitude must be expressed to Professor Ernest Best for his advice, encouragement and inspiration at every stage in the production of this thesis. His help was valuable in obtaining copies of books and articles in foreign journals.

Principal Abbreviations which are not explained in the
text and notes.

AG	Arndt-Gingrich Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament, Chicago, 1957.
ATR	Anglican Theological Review, Evanston.
BDB	Hebrew-English Lexicon of the Old Testament, Brown, Driver and Briggs, Oxford, 1907.
Bib Theol Bull	Biblical Theological Bulletin, New York.
BJRL	The Bulletin of the John Ryland Library, Manchester (now BJRULM).
Bl.Debr.	A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and other early Christian Literature by F.W. Blass and A. Debrunner, trans. and rev. from 9th-10th German editions by R.W. Funk.
CBQ	Catholic Biblical Quarterly, Washington.
Coll.Mech.	Collectanea Mechlinensia, Malines.
Coll.Theol.	Collectanea Theologica, Warsaw.
Conc.Th.Monthly	Concordia Theological Monthly, St. Louis.
DB	Dictionnaire de la Bible, Paris. Supplementary Volumes.
EQ	Evangelical Quarterly, Exeter.
ET	English Translation.
ETL	Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses, Louvain.
EvTh	Evangelische Theologie, Munich.
Exp.T.	Expository Times, Edinburgh.
HTR	Harvard Theological Review, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
IER	Irish Ecclesiastical Record.
Int.	Interpretation.
JBL	Journal of Biblical Literature.
JEcSt.	Journal of Ecclesiastical Studies, Pittsburgh and Philadelphia.
JJS	Journal of Jewish Studies, Manchester.
JQR	Jewish Quarterly Review, Philadelphia.
JSNT	Journal for the study of the New Testament, Sheffield.
JTS	Journal of Theological Studies, Oxford.
NEB	New English Bible.
NIDNTT	The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology, Exeter.
NPhU	Neue philologische Untersuchungen.
NT	New Testament.
NTA	New Testament Abstracts.
NTS	New Testament Studies, Cambridge.

NovTest	Novum Testamentum, Leiden.
OhioJRS	Ohio Journal of Religious Studies.
OT	Old Testament.
PEFQS	Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly Statement, London.
RB	Revue Biblique, Paris.
REJ	Revue des Études Juives.
RevExp	Review and Expositor, Louisville.
RGG	Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart, Tübingen. 1958 ³
RHPR	Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses, Strasbourg.
Rivist Bib.	Rivista Biblica, Brescia.
RQ	Revue Qumran, Paris.
RSV	Revised Standard Version.
SB	H.L. Strack and P. Billerbeck, Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch, Munich 1922-61.
SJT	Scottish Journal of Theology, Edinburgh.
SNTS	Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas.
StEvan	Studia Evangelica, Berlin.
STK	Svensk Theologisk Kvartalskrift, Lund.
St Th	Studia Theologica, Lund.
St Vlad TheolQ	St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly, Crestwood. New York.
TB	Tyndale Bulletin, Cambridge.
TDNT	Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, Grand Rapids, 1964ff. (ET of Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, Stuttgart, 1933ff).
ThLZ	Theologische Literaturzeitung, Halle and Berlin.
TR	The Textus Receptus.
TSK	Theologische Studien und Kritiken, Hamburg. etc.
TU	Texte und Untersuchungen, Berlin.
TZ	Theologische Zeitung, Basel.
UnionSemQR	Union Seminary Quarterly Review, New York.
VD	Verbum Domini, Rome.
VE	Vox Evangelica, London.
VT	Vetus Testamentum, Leiden.
WTJ	Westminster Theological Journal, Philadelphia.
ZAW	Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, Giessen and Berlin.
ZNW	Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche, Giessen and Berlin.
ZTK	Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche, Tübingen.

ABBREVIATED LITERATURE (Commentaries are cited ad loc in this thesis unless the page number is given.)

- Abbott. T.K.Abbott, Ephesians and Colossians, Edinburgh, 1897.
- Alford. H.Alford, The Greek New Testament, vol.3, London, 1862.
- Barth. M.Barth, Ephesians, New York, 1974.
- Beare. F.W.Beare, Ephesians, The Interpreters' Bible X, New York, 1953, 597-749.
- Beck. J.T.Beck, Erklärung des Briefes Pauli an die Epheser, Gutersloh, 1891.
- Beet. J.A.Beet, A Commentary on St. Paul's Epistles to Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians and to Philemon, London, 1890.
- Bengel. J.A.Bengel, Gnomon, English Edition, Edinburgh, 1858.
- Benoit.Corps. P.Benoit, Corps, Tête et plérôme dans les Epîtres de la Captivité, RB69 (1956) 5-44.
- Benoit.L'Hymne. P.Benoit, L'Hymne Christologique de Col.1:15-20, in Christianity, Judaism and other Greco-Roman Cults. Studies for Morton Smith at 60, Part 1, N.T, Leiden, 1975, 226-263.
- Bleek. F.Bleek, Vorlesungen über die Briefe an die Kolosser, den Philemon, und die Epheser, Berlin, 1865.
- Bruce.Paul. F.F.Bruce, Paul, Apostle of the Free Spirit, Exeter, 1977.
- Caird. G.B.Caird, Paul's Letters from Prison, Oxford, 1976.
- Calvin. J.Calvin, Ephesians (1548) Translated by THL Parker, Edinburgh, 1965.
- Candlish. J.S.Candlish, Ephesians, Edinburgh, 1895.
- Chadwick.Absicht. H.Chadwick, Die Absicht des Epheserbriefes, ZNW 51 (1960) 145-53.
- Dahl.Addressse. N.A.Dahl, Adresse und Proömium des Epheserbriefes, TZ7 (1951) 241-64.
- Dahl.Kurze. N.A.Dahl, et al, Kurze Auslegung des Epheserbriefes, Göttingen, 1965.
- Dibelius. M.Dibelius, Epheser, Tübingen, 1953.
- Eadie. J.A.Eadie, A Commentary on the Greek Text of Ephesians, New York, 1861.
- Ellicott. C.J.Ellicott, St. Paul's Letter to the Ephesians, London, 1883.
- Ewald. P.Ewald, Epheser, Kolosser und Philemonbrief ausgelegt, Leipzig, 1910.
- Fischer. K.M.Fischer, Tendenz und Absicht des Epheserbriefes, Göttingen, 1973.
- Foerster. W.Foerster, Gnosis: A Selection of Gnostic Texts, E.T. ed by R.McL.Wilson, Oxford, Vol.1, 1972, Vol.2, 1974.
- Foulkes. F.Foulkes, The Epistle of Paul to the Ephesians. London, 1963.

- Gaugler. E.Gaugler, Epheserbrief, Zurich, 1966.
- Gnilka. J.Gnilka, Der Epheserbrief, Freiburg, 1971.
- Gore. C.Gore, Ephesians, A Practical Exposition, London, 1898.
- Grassi. J.A.Grassi, Ephesians, in the Jerome Biblical Commentary, ed. Brown, Fitzmyer and Murphy. London, 1969.
- Harless. G.C.A.Harless, Commentar "über den Brief Pauli an die Epheser, Erlangen, 1834.
- Haupt. E.Haupt, Die Gefangenschaftsbrieife, Göttingen.1902.
- Hodge. C.Hodge, Ephesians, London, 1856.
- Kirby. J.C.Kirby, Ephesians, Baptism and Pentecost, London 1968.
- Lamadrid. A.G.Lamadrid, Ipse est pax nostre, Estudios Biblicos, 28(1969)209-61 29(1970)101-36 and 227-66, cited as 1,2 or 3 respectively.
- Lindemann. A.Lindemann, Die Aufhebung der Zeit, Gütersloh,1975.
- Martin. G.C.Martin, Ephesians, Colossians, Philemon and Philippians, Edinburgh, 1902.
- Masson. Ch.Masson, L'Épître de St Paul aux Éphésians, Neuchâtel and Paris, 1953.
- Merklein.Amt. H.Merklein, Das Kirchliche Amt nach dem Epheserbriefe, Munich, 1973.
- Merklein.Tradition. H.Merklein, Zur Tradition und Komposition von Eph 2:14-18, BZ(NF) 17(1973) 79-102.
- Meyer. H.A.W.Meyer, Ephesians and Philemon, Edinburgh.1884.
- Mitton. C.L.Mitton, The Epistle to the Ephesians, London. 1976.
- Monod. A.Monod, Explication de L'Épître de St Paul aux Éphésians, Paris, 1867.
- Olshausen. H.Olshausen, A Biblical Commentary on St. Paul's Epistles to Galatians, Ephesians, Colossians and Thessalonians. Edinburgh, 1851.
- Penna.Proiezione. R.Penna, La Proiezione dell'Esperienza Comunitaria sul piano Storico (Ef 2:11-22) e cosmico (Ef 1: 20-23), Rivist Bib 26(1978) 163-186.
- Penna.Paix. R.Penna. L'Evangile de la Paix, in Paul de Tarse, ed.L.de Lorenzi, Rome, 1979, pp 175-199.
- Percy.Leib. E.Percy, Der Leib Christi Σῶμα Χριστοῦ in den paulinischen Homologumena und Antilegomena, Lund/Leipzig 1942.
- Percy.Probleme. E.Percy, Die Probleme der Kolosser und Epheserbriefe, Lund, 1946.
- Pokorný. P.Pokorný, Epheserbrief und gnostische Mysterien, ZNW 53 (1962) 160-194.
- Rader. W.Rader, The Church and Racial Hostility, Tübingen, 1978.
- Rienecker. F.Rienecker, Der Brief des Paulus an die Epheser. Wuppertal, 1968.

- Salmond. S.D.F.Salmond, The Expositors Greek New Testament, Ephesians, London, 1903.
- Sanders. J.T.Sanders, The New Testament Christological Hymns, Cambridge, 1971.
- Schenkel. D.Schenkel, Epheser, Philipper und Kolosser, Bielefeld, 1862.
- Schille. G.Schille, Frühchristliche Hymnen, Berlin, 1965.
- Schlatter. A.Schlatter, Die Brief am die Galater, Epheser, Kolosser und Philemon, Stuttgart, 1963.
- Schlier. H.Schlier, Der Brief an die Epheser, Dusseldorf, 7th ed. 1971.
- Schlier CK. H.Schlier, Christus und die Kirche in Epheserbrief, Tübingen, 1930.
- Simpson. E.K.Simpson, Commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians. London, 1957.
- Stoeckhardt. G.Stoeckhardt, Commentary on St Paul's Letter to the Ephesians, St.Louis, 1952.
- Turner. S.H.Turner, Ephesians, New York, 1856.
- Westcott. B.F. Westcott, Ephesians, London, 1906.
- Zerwick. M.Zerwick, The Epistle to the Ephesians, ed, J.L. Mackenzie, London. 1969.

CONTENTS.

	<u>Page</u>
1. <u>INTRODUCTION</u>	1
1. The Purpose and Plan of the Thesis.	1
1.1 Unsolved Problems.	1
1.2 Important issues.	2
1.3 Detailed analysis of issues raised by the passage.	3
1.3.1 Textual variants.	3
1.3.2 Grammatical and Exegetical Problems.	4
1.3.3 Literary Problems.	5
2. <u>THE PLACE OF THE PASSAGE IN THE GENERAL THOUGHT OF EPHESIANS AND OF THE PAULINE CORPUS.</u>	6
2.1 The Theme of the Passage.	6
2.2 The Theme and Purpose of Ephesians.	8
2.2.1 Arguments for Ephesians not being a letter.	11
2.2.2 Arguments for Ephesians being a letter.	13
2.2.3 Is Ephesians a circular letter?	15
2.3 The Relationship to Ephesians.	20
2.4 The Relationship to Colossians.	21
2.5 The passage and Ephesians in the general thought of Paul.	24
3. <u>PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATIONS.</u>	27
3.1 Ephesians 2.13.	27
3.1.1 "But now"	27
3.1.2 "In Christ Jesus"	28
3.1.3 "You the far have become near"	31
3.1.4 "In the blood of Christ"	31
3.2 Does the passage contain a hymn?	34
3.2.1 Hymns in the N.T.	35
3.2.2 The Criteria for Detecting N.T. Hymns.	38
3.2.3 Col. 1:15-20 is a Hymn Fragment.	43
3.2.4 Eph. 2:14-17 uses Col. 1:20.	45
3.2.5 Contradictory suggestions of Eph. 2:14-17 as a hymn.	46
3.2.5.1 H. Schlier.	47
3.2.5.2 G. Schille.	48
3.2.5.3 J.T. Sanders.	49
3.2.5.4 J. Gnilka.	51
3.2.5.5 Common Inclusions.	54
3.2.5.6 Common Omissions.	54
3.2.5.7/	

	<u>Page</u>
3.2.5.7	Alternative suggestions.
	55
3.2.5.8	Summary.
	60
3.2.6	J.C. Kirby.
	60
3.2.7	The passage is not a hymn.
	62
3.2.8	A passage based on Colossians.
	63
3.3	Is the background Jewish, Gnostic or something else?
	63
3.4	Summary of the Chapter.
	64
4.	<u>EPHESIANS 2:14ab.</u>
	65
4.1	"For"
	65
4.1.1	"He"
	65
4.1.2	"Our"
	67
4.2	"Peace"
	68
4.2.1	Why is the term used?
	68
4.2.2	Grammatical Possibilities.
	68
4.2.2.1	Peace Offering.
	69
4.2.3	Passages which could be in mind.
	70
4.2.3.1	Ephesians.
	70
4.2.3.2	Colossians.
	71
4.2.3.3	Paul.
	72
4.2.3.4	The New Testament.
	73
4.2.3.5	The Old Testament.
	74
4.2.3.5.1	Gen. 3 and 4,
	75
4.2.3.5.2	Melchizedek.
	75
4.2.3.5.3	Other possible O.T. antecedents.
	76
4.2.3.5.4	Isaiah.
	77
4.2.3.6	The Jewish background.
	79
4.2.3.6.1	The Rabbinic writings.
	79
4.2.3.6.2	Apocalyptic writings.
	80
4.2.3.6.3	Qumran
	81
4.2.3.7	The wider background.
	82
4.2.4	Summary.
	84
4.3	"Who made both one"
	84
4.3.1	Why neuter words?
	84
4.3.2	What the passage says.
	87
4.3.3	Parallels to this thought.
	88
4.3.4	Antecedents to the thought.
	89
4.3.4.1	Paul.
	90
4.4	The Middle Wall of Partition.
	91
4.4.1/	

	<u>Page</u>
4.4.1 "And"	91
4.4.2 "Middle Wall"	91
4.4.2.1 Greek parallels.	92
4.4.2.2 "Mesos"	93
4.4.2.3 "Toixos"	93
4.4.2.4 "Phragmos"	94
4.4.2.5 The Genitive.	95
4.4.3 A metaphor.	95
4.4.3.1 A barrier in the temple.	97
4.4.3.2 The fence around the law.	103
4.4.3.3 The law as a fence.	104
4.4.3.4 The wall of Paradise.	105
4.4.3.5 The veil.	105
4.4.3.6 The peculiarity of Israel.	106
4.4.3.7 The law itself.	106
4.4.3.8 An Ephesian temple.	107
4.4.3.9 Hades.	109
4.4.4 A cosmic barrier.	110
4.4.5 What the wall illustrates.	117
4.5 "Loosing"	118
5. <u>EPHESIANS 2:14c-15a.</u>	119
5.1 "The hostility"	119
5.1.1 Jew towards Gentile.	121
5.1.2 Gentile towards Jew.	123
5.1.3 Theological enmity.	124
5.2 "In his flesh"	125
5.3 "The law of commandments in decrees"	128
5.3.1 "The law"	128
5.4 "Commandments"	131
5.4.1 The significance of the genitive.	132
5.5 "In decrees"	132
5.6 "Katargesas"	134
5.7 How much is dependent on either verb?	137
5.7.1 View One.	137
5.7.1.1 View One A.	138
5.7.1.2 View One B.	139
5.7.2 View Two.	139
5.7.2.1 View Two A.	140
5.7.3 View Three.	140
5.7.4 View Four.	141
5.8 Summary.	141

	<u>Page</u>
6. <u>EPHESIANS 2:15b.</u>	143
6.1 "The Two"	143
6.2 "Create"	145
6.3 "In him"	145
6.3.1 The phrase "In Christ".	147
6.4 "One new man"	148
6.4.1 Origin of the concept	152
6.4.2 Pauline parallels.	152
6.4.3 The O.T. background.	153
6.4.3.1 Son of Man	153
6.4.3.2 Adam	154
6.4.3.2.1 Adam as fallen and restored.	155
6.4.3.3 Adam as father of the race.	156
6.4.3.4 Corporate Personality.	157
6.4.4 The First Man	158
6.5 Universalism	162
6.6 "Making peace"	163
7. <u>EPHESIANS 2:16.</u>	164
7.1 "And might reconcile"	164
7.1.1 Antecedents.	165
7.2 "Both"	167
7.3 "In one body"	167
7.3.1 Literal or metaphorical?	168
7.3.2 Possible parallels in Paul.	170
7.3.3 A holistic view?	173
7.3.4 Background to the thought.	174
7.3.4.1 Non-Jewish	174
7.3.4.2 The Jewish background.	176
7.3.4.3 Use of the thought.	177
7.3.4.3.1 The Apostolic Fathers.	177
7.3.4.3.2 The Gnostics.	177
7.4 "To God"	181
7.5 "Through the Cross"	181
7.6 "Killing the hostility"	183
7.7 "In Him"	184
7.8 Conclusion.	185
8. <u>EPHESIANS 2:17</u>	186
8.1 "And Coming"	186
8.1.1 Before his incarnation?	189
8.1.2 During his earthly ministry?	189
8.1.3/	

8.1.3	After his resurrection?	190
8.1.4	In the Holy Spirit?	190
8.1.5	The preaching of the apostles?	191
8.1.6	A combination of the above views?	191
8.2	"Preached peace"	192
8.3	"To you the far ... near"	192
8.3.1	As understood by Jews.	195
8.3.2	As understood by the gnostics.	196
8.3.3	As understood by the writer.	196
8.4	Conclusion	197
8.5	The remainder of the chapter.	199
8.5.1	Strangers and Sojourners.	200
8.5.2	vv. 20-22.	202
9.	<u>FINDINGS OF THE EXEGESIS.</u>	204
9.1	Conclusion.	204
9.2	An underlying hymn?	207
9.3	The background of the passage.	207
9.4	The place of the passage in Ephesians.	208
9.5	Eph. 2:14-17 in its context.	209
9.6	The relation to the Pauline Corpus.	209
9.7	Reconciliation.	210
9.8	Pauline authorship.	212

Notes on chapter one	214
" " " two	215-228
" " " three	229-242
" " " four	243-271
" " " five	272-288
" " " six	289-300
" " " seven	301-315
" " " eight	316-325
" " " nine	326-329

Bibliography	330-342
--------------	---------

SUMMARY OF THESIS.

The exegesis of four verses enables us to discuss whether the author uses existing material and to discern whether the teaching is in harmony with Ephesians as a whole and with Pauline teaching, especially on reconciliation.

Ephesians 2:14-17 speaks of the reconciliation of Jew and Gentile through the reconciliation of both to God. This passage is not hymnic in origin, although it does reveal hymnic characteristics. These are partly due to the style of Ephesians, but mainly appear through the use of Is. 57:19 and Col. 1:20-22. Evidence of a gnostic background to the passage is insufficient.

We have an example of inclusio, where the words *μακράν* and *ἐγγύς* (v.13) are elaborated upon and then cited again (v.17). The word peace in Is. 57:19 prompts the writer to show how Christ is our peace.

The meaning of the term "middle wall" is problematical, but no suggestion is better than that of the temple barrier in Jerusalem about which the readers would know something from the Old Testament. The middle wall illustrates the divisive aspect of the law.

The punctuation of vv. 15, 16 with a comma after *ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ* is to be preferred. The negative statements of breaking down and abolishing are followed by the positive of the creating of a new man and the reconciliation of both Jew and Gentile into one body. *Σῶμα* is used generally and does not refer specifically to the literal body of Christ.

Christ preached this message of peace through the apostles and prophets, who were the foundation members of the church.

The passage is an example of the author's love of Isaiah, whose message the Christ event has fulfilled in a fuller sense than the prophet envisaged. Not only have the Jews of the Dispersion been brought near, but also the Gentiles. This concept is in harmony with the general theme of Ephesians and Pauline teaching on reconciliation. The evidence is insufficient to support the non-Pauline authorship of Ephesians.

CHAPTER ONE. INTRODUCTION

1. The Purpose and Plan of the Thesis.

The title of this thesis indicates that its purpose is to give a detailed exegesis of four verses from the letter to the Ephesians. This investigation will enable us to look at various problems presented by the passage and to discuss issues raised concerning its relationship to the context in Ephesians and to the thought of the Pauline Corpus, in particular of Colossians. The thesis therefore first states the problems and issues involved, discussing them as much as is possible (Chapters One to Three) prior to the exegesis (Chapters Four to Eight). The thesis finally returns to these themes to discover what further light the exegesis has shed upon them (Chapter Nine).

1.1 Unsolved Problems.

The main problem where the work of Commentators¹ has not brought unanimous agreement is structure. This stems from the question as to whether the writer is using older material such as a hymn. Answers to the following points might help us to resolve this issue.

- (a) Ephesians 2:14-17 appears to be a distinct literary unit. Although the passage provides a summary of an essential part of the message of Ephesians concerning the unity of Jew and Gentile in Christ, it nevertheless appears separable from its context with a careful literary structure. This suggests it might have been an already existing composition or part of such a composition, perhaps emended for the present context.
- (b) Two kinds of relationships are combined. Two sets of ideas concerning relationships intermingle; those between Jew and Gentile and those between God and man.² How precisely are these two ranges of thought interwoven and how do they affect one another? Which verses or parts of verses refer to the former idea and which to the latter? Is this blend the result of the writer using previous material such as a hymn, perhaps adapted from a non-Christian frame of thought or source (Jewish, Gnostic or Jewish-Gnostic)?

- (c) The meaning of the "middle wall of partition" is uncertain. "Middle wall" translates a rare compound word and is used here to illustrate a division that has been overcome by the removal of a barrier. Does the phrase "the dividing wall" come from the thought of the author himself or is it from a passage he quotes?
- (d) Ephesians 2:14-17 refers to the reconciliation achieved by Christ. This suggests the writer knows Colossians and is using its particular thought, especially that of Colossians 1:15-20, which many regard as based upon a hymn. Is Ephesians 2:14-17 an adaptation of the cosmic thought of Colossians to human relationships in the church?
- (e) The passage uses Isaiah 57:19. The references to "near and far" in Ephesians 2:13 and 17 could suggest an extended comment on that passage. Is Isaiah used correctly and does the author have Isaiah in mind elsewhere in the passage?

These five points therefore raise the question of whether the passage uses pre-existing material and if so where it comes from (e.g. an extract from a hymn) and whether the background is Jewish, Gnostic or something else.

1.2 Important issues involved in the interpretation of the passage to which we hope to make a contribution.

The five questions we have already mentioned mean it is necessary to discuss certain topics.

1. To examine whether 2:14-17 was pre-existing material, e.g. an extract from a hymn (see sections 3.2 and 9.2).
2. To determine the background of the passage, whether Jewish, Gnostic, a combination of these or something else (see section 9.3).

In addition to these we shall have to discuss

3. The place of the passage in the general thought of Ephesians and how it helps us to understand the whole letter (see section 9.4).
4. The relation to the Pauline Corpus generally and in view of what we said above under (d) its relation to Colossians and to all the teaching in the Corpus on reconciliation (see sections 7.1 and 9.5).
5. To see if the conclusions reached cast any light on the authorship of Ephesians (see section 9.6).

It will be necessary to discuss some of these points in detail (Chapters Two and Three) before the actual exegesis (Chapters Four to Eight) because the interpretation of the four verses depends to some extent upon a correct understanding of these issues. We are aware of hermeneutical circularity and the necessity of weighing all the evidence before reaching any conclusions.

1.3 Detailed analysis of textual variants and statement of main grammatical and exegetical problems.

1.3.1 Textual variants.³

There is only one textual variant of importance and that is *καταργήσας* which D and E have as *καταρτίσας*. The former is supported by some Latin mss d and e (*destituens*) and g (*destruens*). f has *evacuans*. The external evidence for *καταργήσας* is overwhelming.

Ἐν δόγμασιν is omitted in p46. Instead of *κτίσῃ* p47, 116, 118 have *κτίσει* (= the future).

While the majority of mss have *ἐν αὐτῷ, ἐν ἑαυτῷ* is found in several mss and in Patristic writers. (Lachmann, Tischendorf and Tragelless write *αὐτῷ* in the text, but Westcott and Hort have *αὐτῷ*) (see Section 6.3).

For *κοινόν* K has *καὶ γόνον* and F G have *κοινόν*. F has *εἶνα* for *εἰς ἕνα*.

In v16, the *ἀποκατάλλάξῃ* of FG is probably a misreading.

KLP read the future and Theodoret continues "in one spirit to God". We have the problem again of whether it is *ἐν αὐτῷ* or *ἐν ἑαυτῷ* which is more important here than in the previous example, since it affects the interpretation (see Sections 7.6 and 7.7).

In verse 17 the Textus Receptus follows KL, most minuscules, Marcion, Origen and syr^{P.h.} in omitting the second *εἰρήνη*, which is however strongly attested, being found in p46 XABDGP 17 and in the versions except the Syriac.

1.3.2 Grammatical and Exegetical Problems.

The following points need to be pondered:-

- a) The question of punctuation is important in 2:14c-15a, which is why we will study this passage as a unit.
- b) Is enmity in apposition to the middle wall, or is law in apposition to enmity? (see section 5.7)
- c) The New Testament hapax legomenon *μεσότοιχον*. *Ἀποκαταλλάσσω* is only found in Colossians and Ephesians. *τὰ ἀρμότερα*, τοῦ φραγμοῦ and *ἐκθρα* are not found elsewhere in Ephesians.
- d) Why is *τὰ ἀρμότερα* found in 14 and the masculine in 16? (see section 4.3.1)
- e) The question of citation. Does the passage cite a hymn, as well as Colossians and Isaiah?
- f) Are there one or two barriers, a vertical between Jew and Gentile and a cosmic, perhaps mythical one between the worlds above and below? If so, are these two outlooks incompatible or incongruous? Has one been placed upon the other? Does this suggest an underlying hymn which was originally gnostic? (see sections 3.2.5ff)
- g) What is the significance of the genitive *φραγμοῦ*? Is it in apposition to the previous noun, or is it simply for cumulative effect? (see section 4.4.2.5)
- h) What is the significance of the parallels of thought; blood/flesh/cross, both/two, one new man/body, peace/enmity/reconcile, law/commandments, wall/hedge?
- i) Is the law, the Mosaic law, any law or every law? (see sections 5.3ff)
- j) Does *ἐν δόγματι* refer to some aspect of the old law or to the law of Christ? (see section 5.5)
- k) Does the new man mean that Jew and Gentile entities have no more significance? Are Jews part of the new man already? (see section 6.4)
- l) Is the enmity that is killed the same as the enmity that is annulled? (see section 7.6)
- m) How and when did Christ come? (see sections 8.1ff)
- n) Has the writer used traditional material, originating in Jewish Proselyte terminology? (see section 8.3.1)
- o)/

- o) Is the background of the passage gnostic, cultic or Jewish Old Testament?

These are some of the points which the passage raises. We shall be discussing these points as they arise in the text and give conclusions where it is possible to do so.

1.3.3 Literary Problems.

Apart from the possibility of a hymn (see sections 32.5ff) being cited, or verses from Colossians being used, the passage is not affected by partition theories which find two layers in the epistle.⁴

CHAPTER TWO. THE PLACE OF THE PASSAGE IN THE GENERAL
THOUGHT OF EPHESIANS AND OF THE PAULINE
CORPUS.

2.1 The Theme of the Passage.

Verses 14-17 are part of the second section of the chapter since the chapter divides neatly into 1-10 and 11-22. This division is followed in most Greek and English editions of the text and also in the commentaries.¹

The division could be made however between vv12 and 13 and the second part begin with vv1 .² This appears to divide the chapter chronologically between past and present. But this is not exactly the case since vv1-10 have both a past scheme (in 1-4) and a present one (in 5-10). v13 is the contrast to 12 rather than to the whole of 1-12.³ We therefore accept that as far as an outline can be made in such a writing as Ephesians, with its everflowing thought, v13 is best understood as the beginning of a new section of 11-22 and 14 a new part of it introduced by γάρ .

In 14-17 we have an example of the practice of inclusio, whereby a word is mentioned and elaborated upon. It is then mentioned again when the author returns to where the original theme was broken off.⁴ The word which is developed here is παρὰν in 13 which 14-17 expands before returning to that word in 17. 14-17 is a new proof for 11-13. The writer, as it were, says "let me add this" and then picks up the thread of his argument again.

The section 14-17 is a soteriological one, speaking directly of what Christ has done (making both one, breaking the middle wall of partition, annulling the law of commandments, creating one new man, making peace, killing the enmity and preaching) rather than indirectly, as in the earlier part of the chapter, where the emphasis is upon what God has done and is doing. Verse 18 appears to be part of this section since it is likewise in the first person whereas the rest of the chapter except v10 is in the second. But vv14-17 deal more specifically with what Christ has done and v18 with its continuing effects. We notice the change in that verse to the present ἔχωμεν after the previous aorist verbs.

The readers who once were without Christ and alienated from Israel and therefore far away from her (and more seriously from her God, who is the true God) are now near because of the blood of Christ. Christ, who is described as "our peace", has made both Jew and Gentile one and broken down the barrier that divides. This barrier has something to do with hostility, law and commandments, which are removed.

Christ's work has not only this negative aspect, but also the positive side of creating in himself the two into one man, to make peace and to reconcile both to God in one body, killing the hostility. Jesus came and preached peace to the far and to the near. "Until the advent of Christ, the Lord set apart one nation to which he confined the covenant of his grace (Deut. 32:8,9; 10:14,15). Israel was thus the Lord's favourite child. When the mediator was manifested, the middle wall of partition which had long kept the divine mercy within the confines of Israel was broken down".⁵

Within the context of the chapter, the writer seems to be saying "You were Gentiles once, but not strictly so any more. You were (a) uncircumcised, (b) without Christ, (c) alienated from the commonwealth of Israel, (d) strangers to the covenant of promise, (e) without hope, (f) without God. But now you are near to God and part of a new group of people alongside the Jews. You have not joined the Jewish community, but you are joined with the saints and household of God; not built upon Moses and the Old Testament prophets but upon the apostles and prophets, with Christ as the cornerstone (or keystone?). You are built into a new temple. You have been taken from an era of time with its divisions into one of timeless categories."

The parallelism of thought gives three aspects. (a) It speaks of peace, which is found in Christ; (b) it shows how Christ has achieved this ("through his blood", "in him", "in his flesh", "through the cross") (some would add "in one body"); and (c) it depicts his actions in achieving it ("made both one", "create one new man", "reconcile into one body", "makes peace", "came", "proclaims good news").

We have a special reconciliation of Jew and Gentile and a religious one of people with God.⁶ This apparent combination of two different kinds of reconciliation is important and is one reason why an underlying cosmological hymn has been suggested, which is used by the author of Ephesians for Jewish-Gentile relationships.

This connection of the historical with the soteriological, the cosmological and the existential suggests the author finds no antithesis between temporal and spiritual concepts. He has already spoken of his addressees, who belonged to a local church (or churches), as "sitting in the heavenly places and having been chosen in him before the foundation of the world" (1:3,4; 2:6).

2.2 The Theme and Purpose of Ephesians.

1:9,10 speaks of the making known of God's "plan for the fulness of time to unite all things in Christ, things in heaven and things on earth". All things are to be under His feet. The author writes to show that his readers have a share in this purpose. Jews and Gentiles are to be one body under Christ's headship.⁷

The theme widens. It begins with Christ, then mentions Jews and Gentiles, and finally the whole universe. It deals not only with the stages of the unfolding process but with the causes of this unity.⁸ The unity is achieved through Christ as the primary agent and the church as the secondary.

It might be argued that this is simply the theme of the first part of Ephesians, and that the Haustafel and the rest of the paraenetic section have nothing specifically to do with this. Anger and stealing seem a long way off from those who live in the heavenlies. But these obvious and mundane things are clearly linked with the great theme in the very sentences, which contain some of the conjunctive particles (4:1; 4:25; 5:1 and 15) and speak of leading a worthy life, being honest with neighbours, imitating God and walking carefully. The two parts are linked by the theme of calling (1:10; 4:1).⁹

Since/

Since the theme of the first part is unity, we would expect this to be shown as a necessity and reality in the behaviour of the Christian. The second part of the letter is therefore necessary and relevant. The writer has a sense of wonder in the midst of all the mysteries he cannot fathom. We can see how he would be moved by the conviction that his readers who were once far from God (ἀλλοθεν), and from God's special people, are now in a superior position than the natural Jews were previously. He would be particularly moved when he realised it was not an accident of history but God's plan which was achieved through Christ. The wonder of it overwhelms him. Getting back to earth he says "let us act like it".

Prominent also in both sections is the church as a whole, rather than little independent isolated churches (cf. 3:5f).¹⁰

A profitable way of grasping the outline is to discover the significance of the various "therefores" and "wherefores" in the text and to find out the meaning of the respective antecedents, which give rise to these exclamations and challenges. Διὰ τοῦτο (1:15) is preceded by the opening passage 3-14 which speaks of blessing for the readers now and a guaranteed inheritance in the future, resulting from the fact that God has chosen, sealed and redeemed them in Christ and has now revealed his plan to unite all things in Christ and bring praise to himself. Διό (2:11) follows a repetition (2:6) of 1:20, which stated that the readers are in the heavenly places and in particular stressed the great contrast between what they were and what they have become. This is a theme which is continued in 2:11f. Τοῦτου χάριν (3:1) is preceded by a reference to their becoming part of the heavenly structure and the τοῦτου χάριν in 3:14 follows shortly after 3:11, which mentions again the eternal purpose. Οὕτως (4:1) is preceded by a reference to the glory of Christ and Διὸ (4:25) follows 4:23 which says the readers must be renewed. Οὕτως (5:1) states that they must be imitators of God now that they have been forgiven.

All this exhortation shows how Christ is fulfilling God's plan and that the readers have a share in it and must live accordingly. The theme is the plan of God being fulfilled in Christ, which will bring/

bring salvation and unity to all things rather than simply to individuals. Since Christ is already seated in heavenly places, Jews and Gentiles together can share these blessings now. They must live in a new manner because the readers' relationship to God and neighbour has been changed. Unity is to be seen among Christians on earth, reflecting the theological unity of Jew and Gentile in Christ and the christocentric unity which is God's plan for the universe.

When we see that the theme is one of unity, we need not find such a problem in the fact that the church rather than Christ (as usually in Paul) is in the foreground, the body rather than its head, since Christ and the church are one. God's purposes are not fulfilled unless they are together.

Unity is the outward manifestation. What is really fundamental is the divine purpose, which intends this unity. God's purpose for Christ, for the church and for the universe is unity in Christ. Such a theme moves the writer to lofty cadences. H. Schlier thinks that Paul at the end of his life rejoices as he had earlier in Romans 11:33-36 on the mystery of the wisdom of God, as one who had been initiated into this mystery and is concerned for Christians in Colossae and elsewhere in Phrygia, who are in danger of a Jewish-Christian gnosis. Colossians tells them of the danger, Ephesians of the mystery.¹¹

The person who is brought near renounces his former walk (2:1) he sits (2:6) but must also walk (2:10; 4:1 etc.) and stand (6:11). The writer deals with the privilege of the Christian (1-3) and then with the way he should live (4-6).

We cannot be dogmatic about the precise purpose of the letter as this depends on a knowledge of the specific situation of the readers at the time, which is unknown to us and veiled because of the letter's general terms. It is also affected by whether Ephesians was written in Paul's lifetime or not and whether by him or by a disciple. Only this can decide the validity of Holtzmann's judgement that Ephesians was written to celebrate the fact that what Paul had struggled for is becoming a reality with a Church of Jews and Gentiles living together in harmony. He is afraid that the Gentiles might spoil this by going back to their

old ways. The writer uses Pauline teaching on reconciliation with God to speak of reconciliation between Jew and Gentile.¹² Pfleiderer understood this purpose of the book in similar manner and thought that this explained why there is ambiguity sometimes between whether reconciliation of people to God or to each other is meant.¹³

The exegesis in our subsequent chapters will clarify whether this is a likely explanation or whether other explanations which have been put forward are more probable.

A specific milieu for Ephesians is hard to find because of the letter's general nature. This uncertainty becomes even greater if Pauline authorship is thought to be unlikely and when situations subsequent to his death have therefore to be considered. The few historical allusions are understandable if the letter is a general one which began as a homily or if it were meant as a circular letter.

The initial impression is that it is a letter. But this may be a prejudgement on our part since we usually approach it with the preconceived idea that it is. This is because it has the outward form of a letter and is found among the letters of the Pauline Corpus in the New Testament.¹⁴ But it is obvious that it is not a letter in the sense that Philemon or even Romans can claim to be.¹⁵ Several factors could suggest that Ephesians was not at first intended to be a letter.¹⁶

2.2.1 Arguments for Ephesians not being a letter.

a) Its general character.

It is not an individual and personal letter like Philemon.¹⁷

The long inconclusive study of the document's original form and purpose supports this view. There is a general consensus that Ephesians is not so specific in its aims and purpose as the other New Testament writings which are listed as letters.

b) The lack of personal allusions.

These allusions are only found in 1:1 and 15, 16; 3:1-3; 4:1a, 13, 14; and 6:19-23 which raise the possibility that Ephesians is

a homily to which small parts have been added.

c) It is not like other letters in the Pauline Corpus.

Already we have noticed that Ephesians differs from Romans and Philemon. No matter how we minimize these differences, Ephesians is still distinctive in the Pauline literature. Even Colossians (often questioned as Pauline) is much more personal. Ephesians has no specific urgency that is immediately apparent to an independent reader, which is also in contrast to Colossians (2:8). It is written in a relaxed manner, considering the author is in prison (3:1, 4:1). It does not have the note of desperation or suggest a last word and testament (cf. 2 Tim. 4:6-21). Pauline letters have long sentences but not to such an extent as Ephesians (e.g. 1:3-14).

If it were a pseudonymous letter we might expect a certain formal aspect. But this would be true of other New Testament candidates for pseudonymity, such as Colossians, the Pastorals and 1 Peter.¹⁸ However they are written as very personal letters which we have seen is not the case with Ephesians.

d) It is not like other letters in the New Testament.

1 Peter is personal as are the Johannine letters. James,¹⁹ 2 Peter and Jude are more polemical. James has a personal note as well ("my brothers") which is not found in Ephesians.

e) It is not like other contemporary religious letters.

Early Christian writings such as I Clement, The Didache and the Letters of Ignatius and Polycarp are nearer in format to the other New Testament Epistles than they are to Ephesians.

Exact parallels cannot be found among the Gnostics²⁰ or Mysteries.²¹ Ephesians is also different from Seneca's letters to Lucilius on how to live, which clearly state that they are replies.²² Seneca, who flourished during Nero's reign, "declared that a collection of letters dealing with private affairs or a purely temporary political situation was banal and beneath the dignity of literature and that the right kind of collection was one which set forth a philosophy".²³

f) It is not like general letters from the Ancient World. Letters were not a recent innovation since one of the earliest usages of writing was for this purpose. The Old Testament mentions David's letter to Joab (2 Sam. 11:14) and Jezebel's letter (1 Kings 21:8), which are very specific and in the case of the latter had many copies. Nearer in time to the New Testament belong The Letter of Aristaeas and The Letter of Jeremiah (Baruch 6). The latter has no greeting and no personal ending. It begins immediately with the matter in hand.²⁴ In contrast, Ephesians has the Hebrew Greeting and Thanksgiving. The latter is characteristic of Hellenistic letters, which are recognised as the first to have a distinct literary form.

Has Ephesians then no parallels in the secular realm? It is claimed that there are none.²⁵ This observation however must be weighed against the fact that the Ancient World had a tremendous variety of letters.²⁶ The wider the variety is, the easier it is to accept Ephesians as yet another kind, especially when it is claimed that like the Pauline letter Ephesians is briefer and less stereotyped than the Hellenistic ones.

g) It has a liturgical style.

This is a possibility to be investigated since substantial sections of Ephesians are often regarded as having such a form.²⁷

The peculiarities and the unusual style of Ephesians show that if 2:14-17 is unusual it is not so surprising as it would be in a book where the remainder was in prosaic style.

2.2.2 Arguments for Ephesians being a letter.

Counterbalancing the above arguments, it can be said that:-

a) Ephesians is a letter in its present form and has greetings and personal allusions.

They may be few in number but they are there. It is possible that they have been added and that the letter was originally a homily.²⁸ But the reference to Tychicus could explain the absence of personal matters since as "a faithful and beloved brother", who knew both the sender and the hearer (and of their respective present situations), he was well qualified to deal with more personal matters face to face, leaving the letter for what would be/

be regarded as more important themes.²⁹ The author, whether Paul or a disciple, would know only too well how public some of Paul's previous letters had become and that the wider church was learning of the private lives of people in a church like Corinth.³⁰ Safety for himself as a prisoner and his readers would be another reason for giving little information.

Another Prison Epistle, Philippians, has few personal allusions apart from those to Epaphras and Timothy who had visited Paul in prison and whose identity was therefore already known.

b) No other description of Ephesians is any more satisfactory. It is easier to conceive of Ephesians being sent and read than to imagine it being preached. If it is not a letter, we are not sure what it is, whether a meditation or a sermon or a prayer. When such suggestions are made they have to be qualified or it has to be conceded that Ephesians has been transformed into a letter. It may be in hymnic style. But it is scarcely such in its entirety, for this would mean that those who have detected hymns in various places of Ephesians have been wrong in seeing certain passages as distinctive in this way, and those who have denied any hymns at all have been in greater error.

c) The letter's very general nature is what makes it appear to be unlike a letter.

We must not say "a priori" that unless a letter has something specific to say, or at least which a third party can detect as such, that it is not a letter.

The writer clearly thinks he has a tremendous theme. He writes breathlessly without much punctuation. This suggests there was a real reason for writing, unknown to us but clearly understood by his readers. They would know why so much is made of the Jews and Gentiles being one and of the agency of Christ. We have to conclude that it is more like Paul's letters and other New Testament letters than any other contemporary literature which we can suggest.

2.2.3 Is Ephesians a circular letter?

If it were a circular letter (i.e. to a group of churches³¹ rather than the universal church) or written to one church with others in mind this would partially explain its general character and why there is discussion as to whether it is a letter or not. A homily which was altered by the author into a letter through a few additions, with personal explanations and greetings left to Tychicus, can explain the difficulties, particularly if the letter were not meant for one congregation alone.

In view of the impersonal nature of Ephesians and the lack of any obvious situation to which it is specifically addressed, it is therefore natural to ask if there is any evidence that the letter originally had a circular intention. We discover that such evidence is forthcoming.

a) The Textual evidence.

The general inference that the letter has a wider readership in mind is supported by the fact that ἐν Ἐφέσῳ is omitted in some early manuscripts. Moreover there are other variant readings of 1:1.³²

b) Colossians 4:16 refers to a "Letter of the Laodiceans", which could be another title for Ephesians used when a copy was sent to the Laodicean Church. This letter, like Ephesians, is clearly of general interest because the Colossians, who belong to another church, are asked to read it.

c) A circular letter³³ can explain the absence of particular problems because a group of churches can only have general ones pertaining to them all. The writer would not wish to cause divisions of a personal nature between churches.

We therefore look briefly at the textual evidence of which the following is the basic outline:-

τοῖς ἁγίοις οὖσιν καὶ πιστοῖς, p 46.

τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς οὖσιν καὶ πιστοῖς, X' B' 424^c. 1739.

τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς (omit D) οὖσιν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ καὶ πιστοῖς, A etc.

of/

Of these three readings the last two have been discussed as possible originals. The first has not been, since it makes it hard to understand how the other texts would then have appeared.

The evidence shows that *ἐν Ἐφέσῳ* is found in A and the later mss but not in what is called the "B" or Alexandrian text. This latter has Patristic support for Origen knew neither "Ephesus" nor a lacuna and was faced, like us, with the stylistic problems of the Alexandrian text.³⁴ Basil indicates that many, if not all the older, mss lack the reference "to Ephesus", implying that some mss do have the words.³⁵ Tertullian's accusation (that Marcion refers to Ephesians as the Laodiceans) is likely to refer to the title rather than the text of 1:1, but we cannot be sure whether Marcion had a copy with that title, or whether he had emended it himself on the basis of Colossians 4:16, or whether he had emended a text of Ephesians 1:1 similar to our "A" or Byzantine text. It is clear that the letter was known as Ephesians, at least from the second century.

The textual evidence thus raises several problems and suggests various possibilities.

a) The text did not originally have *ἐν Ἐφέσῳ* nor any other name. This is plausible because of the general principle of Alexandrian type readings being earlier than Byzantine ones and for difficult readings to be simplified or expanded. A homily may have been used as a letter and so the name was supplied. Against this is the unlikelihood of an author having the most awkward Greek of his writing at the very beginning. Scholars have debated whether it is grammatical or at least not so bad grammatically as to be impossible. J. Ernst favours a translation like "To the saints existing faithful in Christ Jesus",³⁶ since a place name is more likely to be added than omitted. Colossians 2:3 and 10; 3:1 are not really parallels and Bengel's translation of *τοῖς οὖσιν* by "to the present" is not convincing. He cites Acts 13:1 and Romans 13:1 as parallels, but in the former the place is clearly defined (*τὴν ἐκκλησίαν*) and in the latter no geographical definition is required.

There/

There may be no parallels elsewhere in Greek but that does not alter the fact that we have this grammatical form in a Greek ms (B) and in two different readings. This is a fact although it is difficult to construct and it is hard to know what the passage exactly means. M. Santer overcomes the difficulty by suggesting that a copyist misunderstood and confused the actual text and a marginal reference.³⁷

b) The original text has been misread or deliberately altered. To the former category belong such suggestions as 'Ιώσιν,³⁸ τοῖς Ἀσίαις, καὶ Ἰπρίν, ἔθνεσιν.³⁹ P. Ewald gives a reason for his suggested τοῖς ἀγαπητοῖς οὖσι καὶ πιστοῖς.⁴⁰ He thinks the corner of the ms was damaged so that ἀπη was lost and τοῖς surmised to replace. No breathing would have been indicated in the text.

Whatever the original name,⁴¹ "Ephesus" could have come into the text from a superscription which was given to the letter because of connections with Ephesus. Ephesus was the leading city of Asia and would be central for a letter that was to have a wider circulation.⁴² In Revelation 2 and 3, where seven churches are addressed, Ephesus is the first on the list. Ephesians might have claimed "Ephesians" for herself, since it was a little more complimentary than the one addressed to her in the Apocalypse.

c) There was a lacuna into which different names were inserted. This is a possibility, although there are no parallels⁴³ and the extant mss which are similar to B have no gaps. Tychicus could have possessed several copies for the different churches or gaps could have been left when these copies were made. Into two of these copies, the names Ephesus and Laodicea were inserted.

d) "To Ephesus" was inserted or replaced Laodicea (and Colossae) when the letter was copied in different places.

Perhaps at first a number of identical letters were sent to different churches, each carrying an individual name.⁴⁴ The later copies which circulated used the Ephesian one, omitting the geographical reference. Perhaps jealousy in Alexandria led to the omission of Ephesus.

This last possibility (d) is attractive but does not prove that Ephesians was originally a general letter, only that it was a local letter used for general purposes and found useful to that end.

e) The "Byzantine" text of Ephesians 1:1 represents an older text than the Alexandrian but may not be the original (which could be *τοῖς ἁγίοις πιστοῖς ἐν Ἐφέσῳ*).

The "Byzantine" text is first known in the Latin Commentary of Victorinus Africanus in the second half of the fourth century, but it is supported indirectly by the Muratorian Canon, Irenaeus and Clement of Alexandria.⁴⁵ E. Best shows the difficulties of the text, especially the awkward situation in the sentence of the place name. It is linked with "saints" and "in Christ Jesus" by implication with *πιστοῖς*.⁴⁶ If this text is the original, one could understand the wish to omit "Ephesus" when the letter was given wider circulation. It would also be observed that the writer had appeared not to have visited the church and that Ephesus had not lived up to its reputation (cf. Rev. 2:4). One would nevertheless expect the awkward style of the sentence to be changed with more general words like *ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ* replacing *ἐν Ἐφέσῳ*.⁴⁷

The problem is not easily solved, but "e" is as attractive as any. The evidence suggests that Ephesians would be a letter to a local church, probably but not necessarily Ephesus.⁴⁸ The local and personal details are left for Tychicus to deliver orally.⁴⁹

These are also to be kept to a minimum because the author knows that it will be read (and wants it to be) by other churches. The destination is uncertain from the contents of the book as a whole, and from the textual evidence of verse 1. Therefore in our exegesis of Ephesians 2:14 we cannot automatically assume that the letter was originally written to Ephesus. Whether local or circular, it soon had circular use when the Pauline Corpus was collected and published. Christians today use it as a circular letter addressed to them.

This does not mean that the theory of Ephesians being an introduction to the Pauline Corpus⁵⁰ has to be accepted, especially since/

since Ephesians is never found in an introductory position at the head of the Pauline lists.⁵¹ The letter is either so general that it was soon widely used or was intended for general use from the beginning. The author, whether Paul or not, speaks as the representative of an older group (1:12) to Gentile Christians.

The lack of personal allusions could be because Tychicus was the bearer of the letter and he was left to fill in the personal information. When an author is in prison, it is not wise for him to write too many personal matters in an open letter. They might be read by the prison authorities.

The absence of historical allusions makes it difficult to know why the author stresses unity in the way that he does. There might have been a serious division in the local church, or in churches of a wider area. If the letter is post-Pauline and a general one, there is no limit to the possible situations which can be suggested.

Some recent suggestions include the following:

- a. The letter is a warning to baptized converts.⁵²
- b. It is post-Pauline and is to insist on the vital link between the original Jewish Christian Church at Jerusalem and the mainly Gentile Church of Paul's mission plus the many Gentile Christian churches founded by missionaries outside the Pauline group. All must realise their common bonds with Paul.⁵³
- c. P. Pokorný finds tension caused by the threat of gnosticism, to which the Gentiles are more likely to succumb than Jews.⁵⁴
- d. J. Gnilička thinks it was written at a time (post-Pauline) when Ephesus had declined economically, bringing bigger social differences between the people, rich and poor, and a loss of patriotism through absorption in the vast Roman Empire. Caesar could be seen as Lord on earth and Christ as Lord in heaven. There was the attraction of a syncretistic gnosticism. It was thus a time of crisis for the churches, which the readers did not fully grasp.⁵⁵
- e. K.M. Fischer thinks it reflects a time when the church at Ephesus does not possess the catholic structure of bishops, priests and deacons, but still has the old Pauline order of apostles and prophets as the foundation, together with evangelists/

evangelists, pastors and teachers. The writer wants to avoid the catholic danger, without being too negative to recent gnostic developments.⁵⁶

- f. E. Käsemann believes the Gentiles are in need of humbling and being reminded that their place in the church was of privilege not of right. They were latecomers, built upon a foundation previously laid.⁵⁷
- g. R.P. Martin proposes that it is "to show the nature of the church and the Christian life to those who came to Christ out of a pagan environment and ... that ... Paul never disowned the Jewish background out of which the church came". Ephesians is "a last ditch stand by a well known representative of Paul in his final attempt to regain Asia for the Pauline gospel by publishing an assemblage of Pauline teaching, slanted to achieve several goals" such as preventing a landslide to Gnosticism and to establish a footing for the Gentile Christians in the history of salvation.⁵⁸

These recent examples of suggestions of purpose are based on a study of the entire book but it will be interesting to discover if our passage supports any of them.

2.3 The Relationship to Ephesians as a Whole.

The purpose of 2:14-17 is akin to what we have seen in the purpose of Ephesians as a whole. It shows that Gentiles now participate in salvation on an equality with the Jews.⁵⁹ The theme of Ephesians has been described as "the eternal purpose of God and the place of Christ and his people in that purpose".⁶⁰ The emphasis of the passage before us is more on the latter aspect, stressing the close connection between Christ and his people. It is particularly close to 3:6 which in turn illuminates a particular aspect of 1:10. 1:10, which says that God's plan for the fulness of time is to unite all things in him, is elucidated in 4:16 which speaks of the whole body growing and being built up (note the same two metaphors as in 2:21).

It is not therefore surprising that 2:14-17 is often regarded as the kernel of the book.⁶¹ P. Tachau sees v13 as central⁶² because of the "before" and "now" scheme. This is incorrect since chronology is not prominent. Time is relevant for Gentiles, looking backwards into the past to a certain stage in their history when they came to share in the blessings. But it is not really relevant for Jews at all who have always had access to God. They must forget they once had a privileged position. Moreover the emphasis of v13 is not so much that Gentiles were not Jews, but that they were without Christ and did not have the promise of Christ in the manner which the Jews did.

2.4 The Relationship to Colossians.

The theme of Ephesians must be compared with the theme of Colossians, which Ephesians appears to develop.⁶³ In Ephesians Christ becomes head over the cosmos via the stage of the church, where Jew and Gentile are gathered together in Christ. Instead of the angelic and demonic powers which first century man feared and which have been overcome by the cross (Col. 2:15) there is the division between two groups of humanity which Ephesians stresses has been destroyed. But concepts are used differently. In Colossians, Christ is the head of principalities and powers, which means he is their origin and ruler. He is also head of the church but in a different way, since Christians live from him as the source of their life. Col. 2:19 "not holding fast to the head" (source of nourishment and growth) becomes in Ephesians a growing up into the head for upbuilding (4:15,16).

Colossians may appear to say less about human relationships because of the cosmic emphasis resulting from the dangers which appear to confront the readers from a philosophy concerned with cosmic matters like the powers (1:15-20; 2:15).⁶⁴ But in 1:21ff the reconciliation is concerned with people and in 1:26,27 the mystery concerns Jews and Gentiles (although in Colossians (2:2; 4:3) it appears to be the content of what was hidden as well as the hidden secret itself). The danger leads the writer of Colossians to meet these opponents on their own ground by using their own terms. We have a use of the language of gnosis which was used by the later second century gnostics (e.g. $\eta\lambda\eta\rho\omega\mu\alpha$).⁶⁵

Whether or not Ephesians and Colossians use concepts differently, there is a clear connection between the two writings, so that one must be dependent upon the other, or be derived from a common source, or have the same author. It is not our immediate concern to discuss all the similarities and alleged differences throughout both epistles,⁶⁶ but these similarities are most marked in ch2. 2:1 is similar to Col. 2:13, 2:15 is close to 2:14 (δύμνησιν). Ἀποκατελλάσσω is only found in the New Testament in our passage and Col. 1:20,21. 2:16 is close to 1:20 "having made peace through the blood of his cross".

Holtzmann shows where three passages are parallel:⁶⁷

Col. 1	Eph. 2	Col. 2
20	14	
21a	15	14
21b-22	16	

and where four passages are together:

Col. 1	Eph. 2	Col. 3	Eph. 4
		15	3
21, 22	16	15b	4

However Holtzmann's thesis⁶⁸ of an unauthentic Pauline Ephesians standing between an original authentic Pauline Colossians and our present non-Pauline Colossians which used Ephesians is too cumbersome to be likely.⁶⁹ The view cannot be proved or disproved when the basic premise is that one is dealing with two epistles of whom the authors are unknown. If both are non-Pauline and are by different authors we have one pseudonymous writer using another pseudonymous writing. If Paul did not write both of them, then Ephesians could be by another writer who used the terms differently since the general consensus of opinion is that Colossians is prior to Ephesians. Our exegesis will see if this can be supported.⁷⁰

There are clear similarities, if not a direct link, between Col. 1:20-22 and Eph. 2:14-17. Col. 1:20 speaks of reconciliation and the making of peace through the blood of the cross. But this reconciliation is of "all things" (τὰ πάντα), which is likely to be the "all things" of v 16, which were created "in him", things "in heaven and on earth, visible and invisible, whether thrones or dominions or principalities or authorities" and therefore refers not only to human beings but also to cosmic powers. This reconciliation/

reconciliation would appear to be a unification through Christ's triumph and their submission and display, rather than through being forgiven. However in the next verse (21) the reconciliation is personal and refers to the members of the Colossian church, presumably Gentiles, who were estranged from and hostile to God. There is no direct reference to another who previously had peculiar privileges, but only a reference to those who never had privileges (26) who are called Gentiles (27). There is also the possibility discussed below (Section 3.2.3) that 15-20 is a piece of tradition and v.21 the author's own view in which he personalises the cosmic reference, which only had submission in mind. If 15-20 is a hymn then Col. 1:21 and Eph. 2:14-17 could be two comments upon it for the respective situations of the two letters. "Here there cannot be Greek and Jew ... but Christ is all in all" (Col. 3:11) is an idea akin to that of the new man (Eph. 2:15) where the descriptions Jew and Gentile are irrelevant (cf. Gal. 3:28 and Eph. 5:8).

Col. 2:14 speaks of the demands of the law (*δὸς νόμος*) being set aside through being nailed to his cross (cf. Eph. 2:15, 16). Colossians goes on to mention the principalities and authorities which are not definitely mentioned in the Ephesian passage, although they are in 2:2, 3:10 and 6:12. Ephesians does not give the same warning note about them, because possibly they were not the danger they were at Colosse. If the letter is a more general one, then the danger is more general rather than specific. Colossians shows that the old circumcision is now superseded (2:11, 3:11) and there should now be perfect harmony (3:14ff) with the peace of Christ in control.

Since Col. 1:15-20 is widely recognised as a hymn, we shall need to discuss in section 3.2.5 whether Eph. 2:14-17 is hymnic also. The theme of reconciliation which is common to both passages is discussed in sections 7.1f.

2.5 The place of the passage and of Ephesians in the general thought of Paul.

There is obviously a close relationship, since few would deny Ephesians to the Pauline school. Almost everyone sees either Pauline ideas or a development of them (or even a failure to grasp these ideas). Our exegesis will need to throw light on these questions. But we must be determined not to assume direct Pauline parallels every time we find words or phrases which Paul used (e.g. flesh, body, new man, enmity, etc.). The terms may be used in different ways. New ideas are also found, e.g. in 2:2, 4:13 and 6:12.

Three points are worth remembering:

- a. Paul's thought could change.
- b. A contemporary of Paul could express different thought.
- c. Acceptance of a Pauline or post-Pauline date will affect our approach and whether we think it is different.

We can say dogmatically that both Paul and Ephesians, including 2:14-17, rejoice in the sacrificial work of Christ which unites Jews and Gentiles (Rom. 1-3) and places them on the same level, which was God's purpose from the beginning (Rom. 11). But we wish to know if there is any fundamental difference in what Ephesians and the earlier epistles are saying on these issues⁷¹ and whether Ephesians has a more negative attitude to the law (cf. Eph. 2:15 and Rom. 7:12) and no specific hope for the Jewish nation itself, except as part of the new man, which includes Gentiles (cf. 2:15 and Rom. 11:26). Paul insists in Rom. 4 and Gal. 3 that the blessing of the nation which was the ultimate reference of the promise to Abraham is fulfilled in the universal church which is made up of believers among Jews and Gentiles (cf. Acts 15).⁷² Thus the former hard distinction between Jew and Gentile is removed (Rom. 9:24-26, 10:11-13, 19-21, Gal. 3:28).

Many of the closest parallels between Ephesians and Paul are in our passage e.g. (a) 2:13 and 2 Cor. 5 on reconciliation, (b) the significance of the law and (c) the relation of Jew and Gentile.

Romans 1-3 is concerned with Jew and Gentile who have both been excluded by sin, but are now included by grace through justification. Romans 9-11 shows God's purpose for Israel from the reverse angle to Ephesians. In the latter, Jew and Gentile are both in the one body because the Gentiles have been brought in to share the privileges which the Jews already have. But in Romans 9-11 the Jew at present is outside of the one body but will one day be included.⁷³

Has Paul the same underlying theme of the unity of all things in Christ which we find in Ephesians? This question can be discussed independently from that of Pauline authorship of Ephesians, since presumably a letter can have an independent theme which a writer does not express elsewhere. Ephesians could still be written by Paul without one necessarily having to find the theme of unity in any or all of Paul's letters, provided Paul's main teaching is not contrary to it. This is apart from the fact that Paul's thought could develop or change. However, the theme of unity is in Romans 3:29; 11:32; Gal. 2:7, 8 and 3:28; and Phil. 2:10. The last reference could be hymnic but since Paul is in that case using a quotation he is likely to be in agreement (cf. Rom. 14:11 and Is. 45:23).

The practical emphasis is certainly found in the latter part of many letters. The idea of walking is in Gal. 5:16 and in the paraenetical material of Ephesians one has the similar purpose of exhortation to consistent living which motivates the writing of the second half of most of the Pauline Epistles.

Ephesians does not have the specific Pauline doctrines of justification (but cf. 1:7), judgement, resurrection, eschatology⁷⁴ and specific quotations from the Old Testament. Ephesians has a less qualified universalism than the earlier Paul. Whilst universalism is found in Rom. 5:18; 11:36 and 1 Cor. 15:25, it is clear that this does not necessarily mean that all will be in Christ (Rom. 2:5ff) (see section 6.5). But Ephesians is only a short work and we must not judge it by what it does not contain of Paul, but by whether Pauline teaching as a whole is similar to the teaching of Ephesians and not contradictory to it. The fact that similarities as well as differences can be shown means that the thought content alone/

alone cannot decide the matter of authorship. Paul's accepted Epistles, Ephesians and Eph. 2:14-17 have a lot in common. Ephesians is closest to Paul in the themes of our passage on Jew and Gentile being one in Christ and having access to God. There is nothing fundamentally different in Paul's general outlook from what is found here. But the careful literary style means we must retain the possibility that the author might be quoting from a hymn and combining two realms of thought. See sections 3.2-3.3.

J

CHAPTER THREE. PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATIONS.

Before we look at 2:14-17 in detail we need to discuss verse 13 and study 2:14-17 as a unit with regard to (a) its structure and (b) its background.

3.1 Ephesians 2:13.

In Section 2 it was shown how v.13 begins a new part of 11-22 and is the contrast to v.12. The thought is soon interrupted once more by the literary unit 14-17.

Although 13 is only a single verse it contains important themes which are basic to 14-17 and prompt the flowing thought of those verses. These themes must be clearly understood if the exegesis of 14-17 is to be correct. Verse 13 has four significant elements, "But now", "In Christ Jesus", "Become near", "In the blood of Christ". The third of these is repeated in v.17, which we shall discuss more fully in chapter eight. Verse 13 contains a reference to Is. 57:19 and we need to determine whether the writer has verse 17 already in mind when he writes v.13.

3.1.1 Novi Sè

This is clearly in contrast to *notè* of 2:11 and 13 and the author may also have in mind the previous uses of *notè* in 2:3.¹ Similar contrasts are found in 2:1 and 11, where the metaphors are not of distance (cf. 2:18 and 22) but of death and life, flesh and spirit. In 5:8 the contrast is illustrated by darkness and light (cf. 1 Pet. 2:9).

The Gentiles are reminded here of the change in their circumstances. But the expression can be used of Jews who have had a similar experience. Paul knew such a change personally and uses the phrase of himself in Gal. 2:20. He also uses it of the church's experience in Rom. 3:21, 5:9, 6:19, 7:6, 8:1, 16:26, 1 Cor. 13:12 (contrasted with the future) 2 Cor. 5:16, Gal. 4:9, Col. 1:21, 22, 1:26, 3:8 (2 Tim. 1:10) and of God's activity (Rom. 3:21, 1 Cor. 15:20, Eph. 3:5, 10).

The phrase does not necessarily imply Pauline authorship, since the experience of such a change is fundamental to early Christian belief.² The Psalmist also had this kind of experience.³ However in Eph. 2:13 it is less chronological and more geographical, being related to distance. The contrast is not primarily of Gentiles with Jews but of Gentiles with Christ. The two secondary factors of "alienated from the commonwealth of Israel" and "strangers to the covenant" are placed between the two more serious ones "without Christ" and "without God in the world".

There is no clear indication from the text when the change took place, whether recently or a long time ago.⁴ The fact is, it has happened. The change is obvious, whether or not the readers were all changed at the same time or at different times for individual people.

The writer reminds them of their changed circumstances without any clear warning note as in Galatians. He is not concerned to remind them because he is afraid they would forget they were once alienated from God and wander backwards, but perhaps rather to give them material for praise. This should make us cautious about trying to find out what their local situation actually was. On the other hand, there must have been some purpose which caused the author to write.

3.1.2 Ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ

This phrase is clearly in contrast to *χωρὶς Χριστοῦ*⁵ of the previous verse. It is linked with *νυνὶ* in the same way as the other phrase is linked with *τῇ καιρῷ ἐκεῖνῃ*. It is also probably meant to be in contrast with *ἄλλοι*. The phrase *ἐν αὐτῷ* is found in both vv.16 and 17 so a general discussion of the phrase "in Christ" will be found in Section 6.3.1.

In Eph. 2:13, a number of meanings are possible:

a) Absorption into the deity.

This idea is found in the Mystery Religions.⁶ The "far" with the "near" have been absorbed into Christ through his blood. In v.13 however it is not the result of a once for all initiation but rather of a continuing experience. The verse also teaches that/

that they are near, not in. Moreover the grammar of Eph. 2:13 does not support this hypothesis. A. Deissmann has shown that ἐν with a personal name does not figure in this way in Greek literature.⁷

b) Mystical.

Is "in Christ" like the Pauline phrase which Deissmann understood in the sense of "the most intimate possible fellowship of the Christian with the living spiritual Christ, an ethereal form of existence, where Christ is spirit like the air we breathe"?⁸

It is like the phrase ἐν πνεύματι which occurs nineteen times in Paul with fifteen of these occurrences having the same meaning as ἐν Χριστῷ. Deissmann saw it as a technical expression for the central Pauline thought of fellowship with Christ.

To accept this view in Eph. 2:13 would be to assume that Pauline thought including Ephesians on "in Christ" is stereotyped. It would also assume that Deissmann had the correct interpretation. Serious criticisms can be made of Deissmann's view and few scholars accept it today.⁹

c) Social.

E. Best (while seeing a local emphasis in the Pauline usage) stresses the social aspect of this union. It is not a case of individuals with Christ but of Christians as a whole. Yet it is not simply because they are in the church, since personal faith is involved.¹⁰ This social aspect is present in Ephesians, since Gentiles in Christ along with Jews are a new man, one body (see Sections 6.4 and 7.3).

d) Salvation Historical.

The Gentile readers of Ephesians were "without the Messiah". Christ is the climax of the age, the fulfilment of the Old Testament. Gentiles are now in the new age of Christ. They share in Christ the Messiah with the Jews.

There is undoubtedly some truth here also. But the emphasis of the verse is not that Gentiles were formerly separate from Jews, but that they were without God and without Christ.¹¹

e) Instrumental (Christ as the agent).

If the language follows Hebrew (and LXX) usage, $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ could be the equivalent of ל . In Ephesians it appears to have this meaning in 1:20 and 2:10. But if this is the meaning here, we have two instruments in this verse since "the blood of Christ" appears to be instrumental.¹² Two instrumental phrases are possible but unlikely in v.18 (through him and in one spirit) since "in one spirit" probably has a local meaning.¹³

f) Local.

This understands it as referring to the position of the Gentiles. They are now in Christ.¹⁴ Barth translates "in Christ" as "in the realm of the Messiah" like $\acute{\epsilon}\nu \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\omega}$ of v.15.¹⁵ Gentiles are now in Christ, not just by what he did in breaking down the barrier, killing the enmity, etc., but by the effect of it, in the relationship we now have with him. We are in Christ, just as we are in the heavenlies (v.11). Believers are in Christ, not in the sense of a mystical experience or through an initiation (baptism or the Lord's Supper are not mentioned in the passage) but more in the Jewish sense of corporate personality,¹⁶ whereby one like Adam or Christ includes his descendants in himself. It is true that Adam is not mentioned and that 'new man' may not refer to this contrast, but it is clearly a possible interpretation.

We conclude that here the phrase is likely to have a local meaning (the readers' present position), is chronological (contrasting with the past position) and is social (their position together with the Jews). The context shows a new era has dawned. It is now the age of the new man in whom Jews and Gentiles can share. "In Christ" is more than local and temporal, it is "hyper cosmic" and "indicative of a new dimension that opens itself up for the Christian".¹⁷

$\acute{\epsilon}\nu \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\omega}$ is placed first for emphasis and is to be connected with $\nu\upsilon\iota$ rather than $\acute{\epsilon}\nu \epsilon\theta\eta \tau\epsilon$.¹⁸

"In Christ" has a suffix "Jesus" (although omitted by L., Marcion, Irenaeus, Origen and Tertullian). Paul prefers Christ Jesus. The writer of Ephesians, like other New Testament writers, is not fond of the ascription "Jesus" on its own when referring to the exalted/

exalted Lord. He invariably connects it with "Lord" or with "Christ". Χριστός would speak of the Jewish Messiah. Gentiles also can find blessing in him as promised to Abraham "in you shall all the families of the earth be blessed".

3.1.3 ὑπεῖς οἱ ποτὲ ὄντες μικρὰν ἐγενήθητε ἐγγὺς

ὑπεῖς is stressed as in v.11 and earlier in v.1. Verses 11 and 17 suggest a reference to Gentiles which the writer usually implies when he writes ὑπεῖς.¹⁹ In the next verse he changes to ἡμῶν and to the thought that Jew and Gentile are made one.

The present participle ὄντες relates to ποτὲ and therefore refers to what precedes the main verb. This is normally what the aorist participle does, so the frequentative or durative sense must be meant.²⁰ The aorist passive ἐγενήθητε suggests not a gradual drawing near but being near as the result of a decisive act. This action is clearly connected with "Christ Jesus" (13a) and more specifically with "his blood" (13b).

The "far" are Gentiles, who are no longer at a distance. The term "far" seems to be prompted by verses 11 and 12 and the author's general knowledge of the Old Testament and Christianity's Jewish background. He is reminded in particular of Is. 57:19 with its contrast between far and near, which he quotes in verse 17. Before he actually quotes it, the thought of peace to the far and near makes him think of Christ our peace. It is possible that having written the present verse 17 he goes back and inserts 14-16.

3.1.4 ἐν τῇ ἀγάτῃ τοῦ Χριστοῦ

This is more than a mere repetition and enlargement of "in Christ Jesus" (which we have understood basically as a local phrase). It adds a statement of the special way in which we are brought near in Christ.²¹ It parallels "cross" and probably "flesh". If a hymn were cited then the meaning of cross could originally have been different or the word not found at all. When we accept that 14-17 comes from the same author, we have no difficulty and "blood" can be easily related to "cross" with both referring to the sacrifice of Christ.

We do not have the *δα* of 1:7 and Col. 1:20, Heb. 9:12, Acts 20:28 and Heb. 13:12, but *ἐν* as in v.15, Rom. 5:9, Heb. 10:19, 1 John 5:6, Rev. 5:9 and 7:14.²²

ἐν can hardly have a local sense here although this literal meaning is possible in Heb. 9:25 and 10:19.²³ It is likely in this context to be either causal (because of) or instrumental (through or by).²⁴ There may be a contrast with the use of *δα* in 2:16, 18 and 1:7. Alford suggests that *δα τοῦ αἵματος* in 1:7 speaks of the blood of Christ specifically as the means of our redemption and here *ἐν τῷ αἵματι* is spoken of inclusively as representing the redemption as a whole.²⁵

The author firmly believes that redemption is through the blood of Christ (1:7) and this is akin if not identical with Pauline thought. Colossians, the nearest writing to Ephesians, states that "peace is through the blood of his cross" (1:20). The word "blood" is found in later readings of Col. 1:14, but this is probably the result of assimilation to Ephesians 1:7.

Ephesians only uses the word elsewhere in 6:12, where its connection with "flesh" depicts humanity and its weakness in contrast to the might of the principalities and authorities.²⁶

What does the author mean by "his blood"? In seeking to discover this, we need not discuss the origin of the ideas and (a) what blood meant originally in the Old Testament²⁷ and (b) our modern ideas of how the blood of Christ should be understood. What is important are the ideas in the first century of our era which would possibly be held by the author or influence his thinking.

Apart from Jewish ideas, his readers and perhaps himself could have been influenced by beliefs in the pagan world, e.g. the Taurobolium in the rites of Cybele and Mithra and the Attic Mysteries, where one allowed the blood of slain animals to run over the body and also drank it.²⁸ This however is more akin to John's idea.²⁹ Similarly in the Dionysus Zagreus Cult, union is achieved with the deity by eating the divine animal torn and consumed in a wild frenzy.³⁰ These concepts as well as Jewish ones/

ones may come from the same root originally³¹ but this is a long time before Ephesians.

Salvation by blood is hardly a gnostic idea. It is too materialistic for that. It can have no place in a religion that describes a redeemer descending and bringing salvation through revelation and enlightenment.

The author would share some of the current Christian ideas about the blood of Christ.³² These could be either sacramental, incarnational or a sacrificial theology of the cross. The three possibilities are not necessarily mutually exclusive. There is no clear support from Ephesians for a sacramental theology despite the suggestions of outlines of Baptismal Services that have been made.³³ The idea of salvation by the blood of Christ would doubtless be encouraged by the Lord's Supper, but this is different from saying that Ephesians teaches that believers share in the blood of Christ at the Lord's Supper.

A reference to the incarnation could be argued if v.17 is understood as being a reference to Christ's coming at his birth and his preaching during his earthly life. We shall see in ch.8 that this is unlikely.

There is no reason to doubt that like "cross" in v.16 blood refers to the death of Christ.³⁴

Leviticus 17:11 says "the life of the flesh is in the blood" and Deut. 12:23 that "the blood is the life". This would suggest that in the New Testament the blood of Christ would refer to his life.³⁵ By the outpouring of blood, life was released and in offering this to God the worshipper believed that the estrangement between him and the Deity was annulled, or that the defilement which separated them was cleansed.³⁶

The imagery of blood would be meaningful to the writer if he were a Jew but less so to his readers. But since the leader, in whom they had come to believe, was crucified as a felon they must understand the offence of the cross, that he was their sacrifice who/

who gave himself in entirety for them. Jesus through his death has brought peace between Jew and Gentile because both are through sin really on the same footing before God. The right of access through offerings, etc., stands no more as a possibility. Access is now through the blood of Christ. Through his reconciling death the Gentiles have free access to God in a new temple with the full rights which belong to his house.³⁷

There is no need to have recourse to a mystical interpretation as Deissmann does. He describes the concept of blood as a "vivid way of realizing the living one, who is also the crucified and with whom we live in mystical and spiritual fellowship of blood". Deissmann regards the expression "in the blood of Christ" as differing only slightly, if at all, from "in Christ".³⁸

Through Christ's blood, Gentiles are brought near. Eph. 1 says it is the means of redemption and forgiveness. We thus have some of the variations found in Paul.³⁹ A close parallel to the idea of Ephesians 2:13 is Heb. 13:12 "that he might sanctify the people by his own blood" which means he set apart Jew and Gentile.⁴⁰ Eph. 2:13 declares that far off Gentiles have been brought near through the blood of Christ. The next few verses will show explicitly how Jesus has achieved this.

3.2 Does Ephesians 2:14-17 contain a hymn?

This discussion is much more fundamental than may superficially appear to be the case, since the hypothesis of a hymn or excursus is assumed in much exegesis of Ephesians. This is because of the following reasons:-

- a) The composite nature of the passage, with theological (which includes sociological), cosmological, and soteriological aspects of reconciliation, can possibly be explained if a hymn about cosmic relationships is used of Christ reconciling Jew and Gentile.⁴¹
- b) The passage is Christological, which naturally recalls the Christological hymns of the New Testament, such as Phil.2:5-11, Col. 1:15-20, 1 Tim. 3:16, 1 Peter 3:18,19 and possibly Heb. 1:3. These speak of Christ's humiliation and exaltation and laud what he has done in redeeming men.

c)/

- c) The passage has many of the criteria which are commonly used for identifying hymns (see section 3.2.2).
- d) There are clear links with Col. 1:15-20 which is hymnic.
- e) Hymnic or confessional formulae have been suggested elsewhere in Ephesians, e.g. 1:3-14, 20-23, 2:4-7, 10, 20-22, 3:5, 20-21, 4:4-6(8), 11-13, 5:2, 14, 25-27.⁴²

If the section does contain a hymn, many possibilities are raised.

Is it:-

- a) Pauline and original to Ephesians?
- b) Pauline and written previously?
- c) Pauline and based on Colossians? (Pauline and based on non-Pauline Colossians would be unlikely).
- d) Non-Pauline and based on Pauline Colossians?
- e) Non-Pauline and based on non-Pauline Colossians?
- f) Non-Pauline and based on a Christian hymn?
- g) Non-Pauline and based on a Christian gnostic hymn?
- h) Non-Pauline and based on a Jewish-gnostic or gnostic hymn?

This would require interpolations to have been made.

3.2.1 Hymns in the New Testament.

Singing was a feature of Jewish worship and Jesus is reported to have sung (Mk. 14:26, Mt. 26:30). "ᾠραῖν" is found elsewhere in the New Testament (Acts 16:25, Heb. 2:12) but this does not help our enquiry since no hymns are cited in these instances. We have ᾠδαῖν in Col. 3:16, Eph. 5:19, Rev. 15:3 and ψάλλειν in Eph. 5:19.⁴³ It is doubtful if a distinction can be made between "psalms, hymns and spiritual songs" (Col. 3:16, Eph. 5:19),⁴⁴ especially since Ephesians often puts similar words together for emphasis. If the author is citing Colossians the triple word formula would be naturally attractive to him.

The early church has left us little knowledge of the form of its worship since it was self-evident to them and not recorded, unless there were disorders as at Corinth. No library of an early Christian community like that of Qumran which contained community hymns has been found, e.g. at Nag Hammadi. The wedding "hymn" and the "Song of the Pearl" in the Acts of Thomas 2 and 9 do not fit into this category.

The early Christians were Jews and would continue to sing. Gentile Christians would be aware of synagogue worship and would use the Old Testament.⁴⁵ The Psalms would be their first hymnbook⁴⁶ and messianic Psalms would give the initiative. The belief that Christ had been raised would direct the Christians' attention to Ps. 110 and suggest the exaltation to God's right hand.⁴⁷ There would be the post-Easter enthusiasm and the joy experienced at the Lord's Supper, which could only be expressed in a hymn.⁴⁸ All new religious and liberation movements tend to be full of song.

Christians who lived outside of Palestine would find Hellenistic parallels in the same way as Hellenistic terms like Lord and Son of God gave biblical terms a fuller meaning.⁴⁹ It would have been surprising if the early church in ascribing worship to its Lord did not use all kinds of epithets. In a world that used the one Greek language, there would be overlaps. One of the features of Greek-Roman religion was hymnology, where hymns were offered to cult divinities.⁵⁰ Converts from the Mysteries and Greek Philosophy would bring their ideas of music with them.⁵¹

Since singing is so obvious, we ask what did they sing? Where is it? Would it all disappear? They are unlikely just to have sung Old Testament songs and it would be surprising if some of this material is not embedded in the New Testament.

Some New Testament songs can be detected, such as the four in the early chapters of Luke, the Magnificat, 1:46-55, the Benedictus, 1:68-79 and the shorter songs of the angels 2:14 and the Nunc Dimittis 2:29-32. There are also several in the Revelation.⁵²

The Lukan ones are often regarded as Jewish hymns which the church used.⁵³ Other fragments are possibly Rom. 11:33-6, 1 Tim. 1:17, Amen, Hallelujah, Hosanna, Abba, Maranatha.

In the Magnificat and Benedictus, the only specific Christian content is in 1:79-9.⁵⁴ These songs probably belonged to the earliest Christians, before a specifically Christian theological language had developed.⁵⁵

The Revelation songs are more specifically Christological, speaking of the death of Jesus and his glorification, which causes all creation to worship him. But they are not always included in compiled lists of New Testament Christological Hymns because of their Jewish background. J.D.G. Dunn thinks the influence comes "more from the synagogues of the diaspora where the holy and righteous God of Judaism was praised as Creator and Sustainer of the world and judge of all". Dunn finds four groups in the New Testament:-

- a) The simple Lukan Psalms of Palestinian-Jewish Christianity.
- b) Those in Revelation from Hellenistic-Jewish Christianity.
- c) Phil. 2, Col. 1, John 1 and Heb. 1 from a very different more sophisticated form of Hellenistic-Jewish Christianity.
- d) 1 Tim. 3:16 and 1 Pet. 1:3-5, etc., reflecting yet another side of Hellenistic Christianity.⁵⁶

We now discuss the hymns which are more widely accepted as Christological. Deichgraber finds an earlier form of Christian hymn, the God Hymn (Rom. 11:33-6, 2 Cor. 1:3f, Eph. 1:3-14, 1 Pet. 1:3-5) but the evidence for isolating them as a common group is not sufficiently strong to gain wide acceptance.⁵⁷

The Christological ones are those which have "the pattern of a redeemer figure, who descends to the earth from a higher sphere, achieves his redemptive purpose on earth and ascends again".⁵⁸ The two hymns which are specifically cited in the New Testament, Eph. 5:14 and 2 Tim. 2:11-13 are not normally included because they do not give this description of Christ.

The two which are most widely accepted are Phil. 2:5-9 and Col. 1:15-20. The Philippian passage has parallelism ($\rho\sigma\phi\eta$ in 2:6 and 7) and a threefold picture of Christ (before he came to earth, when he came and since he came). But there has been much debate as to whether its background is Jewish and Old Testament (e.g. the Servant or Isaiah) or Hellenistic because of its teaching of pre-existence and of two simultaneous spheres (above and below) rather than two successive ages. Some have seen a reference to the heavenly man of the gnostic redeemer myth.⁵⁹ The fact that Phil. 2:5-9 has similarities to Col. 1:15-20 in its cosmic understanding of redemption might suggest it cannot be fully explained from the Old Testament.⁶⁰

3.2.2 The Criteria for Detecting New Testament Hymns.

How does one discern a New Testament hymn or hymnic fragment and how it is isolated from its prose context? Several lists of criteria have been drawn up.⁶¹ M. Barth has summarised the list, which includes the following:

- a) Words like "as, because, for, therefore" are found at the beginning or end of the passage.
- b) A vague phrase occurs like "he is the one" or "who" instead of a name. This sometimes affects the grammar (1 Tim. 3:16, Col. 1:15-20).
- c) Specific deeds of God or of Christ are preferably described, either by the participle (Heb. 1:3), usually in the aorist,⁶² or by relative clauses, ἵνα, ὥστε infinitives or prepositions "for", "toward" with a noun.
- d) Beneficiaries are referred to as "us" or "our", i.e. in the first person plural (cf. Acts 17:28).
- e) There is brevity, with no article before key terms (1 Tim. 3:16). But the text yields to synonyms, genitives of apposition and baroque repetition.
- f) Hapax legomena occur suggesting the author makes use of other vocabulary (Phil. 2:6-11).
- g) The text can be divided easily into lines of similar length (Titus 1:12 has short lines).
- h) Elements of careful structure distinguish the piece in question, e.g. parallelism, division into stanzas consisting of three or more cloa and an opening key word or summary statement. The end may take up the beginning (i.e. inclusio).

The following would also be features of a Christian hymn or confession:

- i) The text offers a summary of the message of Christ, the kerygma, but is not concerned about historical accuracy.
- j) The cosmic extension of God's or Christ's role is emphasised. Liberal borrowings from pagan mythology are made in order to communicate Christ's cosmic role in a language that is understood by men of the Hellenistic world.
- k) The content of a given passage interrupts the context. The preceding or following verses fit or allude to only a small section of it.

Barth does not accept all of these criteria and i and j are particularly subjective.⁶³ k only indicates an excursus, not necessarily a hymn. Bornkamm has a similar list of criteria and also stresses antithetical style and the use of anaphora and epiphora (the opening and ending of words are composed of the same vowel sounds).⁶⁴

K.M. Fischer divides the criteria into two groups, outer and inner criteria. Outer criteria⁶⁵ include indications of quotation (e.g. Eph. 5:14, 1 Cor. 15:3 and Romans 10:8), distinctive style, different terminology and a co-ordination of the quotation to the context. Fischer's two inner criteria deal with clues from grammar, syntax vocabulary and the different hermeneutic function of liturgy and letter, which enable us to distinguish the genre. The letter exhorts and explains. The liturgy is just concerned with praise.

The suggested criteria do not fit the Magnificat which has few participles all of which are subsidiary to the main verbs in 50 and 53. Relative clauses *ὅτι*, *ὅτι*, etc., are absent (except *ὅτι*). God is addressed directly, the first person plural is not found, rather the first and third persons singular. Articles are very prominent. There are few genitives and no hapax legomena.

Lk. 1:46-55 is certainly a semitic passage, but it is in koinē Greek and by the writer of the third gospel. Any early Christian hymns, even those from a Hellenistic background, would be likely to have Hebraic tendencies because of the use of the Old Testament. It cannot be dismissed entirely that an Ephesian hymn would have to be different from one in Luke. Luke may have found the hymn in his sources and it is full of Old Testament language. But we cannot be so dogmatic as Daichgraber in refusing to accept it as a Christian hymn.⁶⁶ Even if it is not specifically Christian, it is still hymnic.

The Benedictus⁶⁷ does not have Barth's first criterion. Instead of a vague phrase, it mentions the Lord the God of Israel. Criteria c and d do not apply here. e is supported by "redemption, horn, salvation, house, servant, mouth, prophets, salvation, enemies, hand, covenant, oath, prophet, highest, way, etc." having no article. Compassion/

Compassion and mercy, shadow and darkness are found in couplets. The song divides easily into lines and h and j could be true. Like i, it has a kerygma, although it is not a specifically Christian one. Its present draft is either by a Christian writer or at least acceptable to him for quotation and it is a passage dealing with the note of praise.

Rev. 1:5f has the criteria listed as b, c, d, e. For example, there is no article with *Βασιλείαν*, *ἱερεῖς*, *πατρὶς*. Eph.5:14 has the article and 11 Tim. 2:11-13 has the first person. 1 Tim. 3:16 has the vague "who" and no proper name. It could easily have participles but has none.

Other suggested hymnic fragments are too short for us to be able to test the criteria accurately. The list can be a useful guide, but is not completely reliable. It is based on known hymns and also on the style of conjectured ones. It could be possible that different church groups at the time could have vastly different hymns. We have today in Scotland, Paraphrase and Psalter, Episcopal Psalm and Sankey Hymn as well as Standard Hymns. It is true that they are the results of a long Christian tradition. But early Christianity was not as uniform as we would like to make it, and the religious tradition of Scotland is by no means as diverse as the pagan/Jewish religion background of Christianity.

There are just a few Psalms that have a similar approach to praise as our passage. In Pss. 46, 48 and 124 a group of people speak of what God (third person singular) has done for them (first person plural). In the communal songs of thanksgiving one usually has the second person plural or the cohortative ("let Israel now say" Pss. 124 and 129).⁶⁸ The individual praising God is a frequent feature (Pss. 9, 18, 30 and 40).

The peculiarity of the style of Ephesians suggests that his poetical style would be peculiar too and found in places that are not obvious. It is also necessary to remember that where scholars have found gnostic elements in the New Testament, it has often been in these hymn-like passages.

It/

It is not enough to look for obvious hymnic features. Where a hymn is quoted indirectly and used in a different context (e.g. a Wisdom, Jewish or gnostic hymn applied to Christ) it would not always be preserved in its original form, since this would not always be suitable. When cited in prose literature, such as a letter, parts would be omitted and words added. Scholars therefore must seek to reconstruct the hymn and excise alleged glosses or accept that the hymn is incomplete.

There is an obvious danger of subjectivity and inconsistency, or of minimising the creativeness and originality of the author and the scholar underestimating his own. The author himself by our standards might be inconsistent.

Of the eleven criteria which were listed on p.36, Eph. 2:14-17 has several. It has a (γάρ 14), b (αὐτὸς 14), c (ποιήσας 14, καταργήσας, ἵνα 15, ἀποκτείνας 16, ἐλθὼν 17) and d. (ἡμῶν although the second person is found in 16 and the third in 17).⁶⁹

e. There are synonyms and genitives but, on the other hand, most of the nouns have the article.

f. Μεσότοιχον and τὰ ἀρρότερα φραγμοῦ, ἔχθρα are unusual words.

g. A division can be shown to be the case but this often involves the omission of words if the lines are to be equal in length.

h. The parallelisms indicate careful structure.

i. The text is a summary of the message of Christ, but not so much of his achievement of salvation for men as of his reconciling men to each other.

j is true and a case can be made for k since verse 17 takes up the thought and expressions of v.14.

The use by Ephesians 2:14-17 of the criteria is at first sight quite impressive but we remember that these criteria are drawn up on the basis of passages like Eph. 2:14-17. No New Testament writer composed a hymn using our pattern as a blueprint.

The distinctiveness of our passage could be that it simply has the character of an extended comment.⁷⁰ A larger number of hymnic criteria than in a normal prose passage might be the result of the author/

author being caught up with his subject as often happens with preachers. If the author is not Paul, the author could be a person whose style is more fond of flowing language than Paul, as the rest of Ephesians seems to indicate. The author likes unusually long sentences (1:3-14 and 15-23) and prefers relative and participial constructions. He has prepositional expressions and chains of genitives and a wealth of attributive adjectives. He likes synonyms.⁷¹ Thus, of the criteria we found in the passage, the following are possibly true of the author's style or at least of language elsewhere in the book, particularly in the first part, e.g. a) 3:1 and 14, b) 1:7, c) 1:3ff, d) 1:3ff, e) 1:17ff which has many articles before nouns (not *πνεῦμα* and *σοφία*), 17 has synonyms and many genitives. f) There may not be many hapax legomena but the style is unusual. g) and h) seem hardly to apply but i) and j) can do so and as regards k) the book is well-known for its digressions (2:2-4, 3:2-13) and long sentences.

Although verses 14-18 summarise the message of Ephesians they do seem to be a distinct entity, since 13 and 18 are similar and 19 could possibly follow 13 without loss to the argument.⁷² This does not necessarily mean it must be a hymn or have a separate authorship. If Cor. 6:14-7:1 is distinct but it is probably not a hymn. But even if Eph. 2:14-17 were proved conclusively to be a hymn, this does not prove it is a revision of the gnostic redeemer myth. If it is poetical, it could be the author's own refinement of the cosmic Christological hymn preserved in Col. 1:15-20.⁷³

The hymnic character of Col. 1:15-20 is widely recognised.⁷⁴ We suggest that in Ephesians the theme "far and near" brings Is. 57⁷⁵ to the author's mind, which he follows with a reference to Col.1:20. The writer is inspired by the two quotations, Is. 57 and Col.1:20. This hypothesis is supported as follows:-

- a) Col. 1:15-20 is a hymn.
- b) The Ephesian passage used v.20 rather than Col. 1:15-20.
- c) The hymnic arrangements that have been suggested for Eph.2:14-17 are so varied and often contradictory that if a hymn is used it is by no means complete or like its original form.
- d) The hymnic style of the section is more likely to be the writer's own composition. It is hardly a hymn but has some hymnic/

hymnic characteristics, partly due to receiving inspiration from the hymn in Colossians. Like preachers in every generation, it is more than likely that the writer will draw upon the common liturgical traditions and confessional formulae. When he writes to his fellow Christians, he does it almost as second nature, without being aware of it.

This view is akin to H. Merkley's suggestion that the author of Ephesians used material in part hymnic and in part liturgical (in this case from Colossians) to create his own hymn-like passages. We differ from him in not denying the possibility of Ephesians being written by Paul and in saying that it is Col. 1:20-22 which he actually uses, although he may have been inspired by the rest of the passage. Col. 1:20-22 speaks of reconciliation to God of those who were once estranged. He now broadens it to include the union of Jews and Gentiles.⁷⁶

3.2.3 Colossians 1:15-20 is a Hymn Fragment.

This view has achieved wide acceptance in this century. In 1913 E. Norden⁷⁷ arranged it in hymn-like form, but even now there are still difficulties.

a) What kind of hymn was it?

Was it originally a Christian hymn written by the author or cited by him? Or was it a hymn in praise of wisdom, which has been substantially emended?⁷⁸ It could therefore have been a Jewish hymn influenced by Hellenistic teaching, as is known in the hypostatization of Wisdom (cf. Wisdom 7:22ff) and in the Stoic "Allmachtsformel" $\tau\alpha\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha\ \delta\iota'\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$. Later wisdom speculation may have had Stoic influences, but Stoicism cannot explain the need of the reconciliation of all to one who is the source of the existence of all since oneness is already there. A Gnostic connection has therefore been suggested, where a cosmic redeemer is found.⁷⁹ The concept of the image of God has links with Hellenistic Judaism and Gnosticism. Many like Kasemann see the idea of a Gnostic Redeemer as supposedly found in Judaism before Christianity.

The question of whether there was such a thing as pre-Christian Gnosticism/

Gnosticism will come before us many times, especially in chapter four, when we discuss the middle wall. But at this stage we can go as far as to say that Colossians "uses an already existing hymn in which Christ is portrayed as Lord of the universe and redeemer of the church to refute an incipient gnosis which denied the Lord's supremacy and uniqueness as mediator between God and man".⁸⁰

b) There is a lack of unanimity over its purpose prior to its insertion in Colossians. Kasemann thinks it was used in a baptismal liturgy but other scholars suggest other kinds of Christian services.⁸¹

c) The suggestions of the hymn's original format are varied. Not all agree that only 15-20 are needed for the hymn.⁸² There is discussion also over the number of strophes in the hymn. Norden isolated two verses 15-18a (Christ and Creation) and 18b-20 (Christ and the Church) but later reconstructions often find an intermediate strophe 17-18a.⁸³ Some have suggested four strophes or even five.⁸⁴

There is disagreement over what is to be omitted⁸⁵ either for poetical or theological reasons. If the hymn is not Christian in origin, phrases like "the church" and "through the blood of his cross" have probably been added.⁸⁶ The hymn could be Christian and still have these later additions.

d) Some of the characteristic criteria used for identifying hymns are infrequent.

There are few hapax legomena⁸⁷ and only one participle (v.20) (besides *ἠρτυένω*).

But against these arguments must be weighed the following evidence in favour of a hymn:

- a) The similarity to Phil. 2 in cosmology and soteriology for praising what Christ has done and is doing.
- b) It is fastened to v.14 by a relative and has other hymnic words like "he", "because".
- c) Although it can be said to fit into its context reasonably well, the context each side fits together perfectly well without it, e.g. 13 is deliverance from darkness, 14 is forgiveness of sins, 21, 22 is reconciliation from estrangement.

d)/

- d) Although there are not many hapax legomena there are an unusual number of rare words that occur together, such as image, invisible God, firstborn, visible and invisible, thrones, dominions, cohere, fulness, creation, pre-eminence and reconcile (with ἀπό).
- e) There is evidence of careful structure with parallelism, etc. This is most striking in 15 and 18b which both begin ὅς ἐστιν and are followed respectively by εἰκὼν... πρωτότοκος and ἀρχὴ πρωτότοκος

16 and 19 continue this parallelism with ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ in both sections.

In between these two sections we have καὶ αὐτός twice. We also have τοῖς οὐρανοῖς and τῆς γῆς 16 reversed in 20. Δι' αὐτοῦ and εἰς αὐτόν are found in 17 and 20.

Thus 15 and 18b do appear to be parallel strophes, but in the second parts of both of the strophes it is impossible to say whether parts which conceal the poetic structure have been added or omitted by the Colossian author. Benoit may be correct in suggesting that the author uses one strophe and adds another with progressive elaboration during a period of imprisonment when Ephesians and Colossians were written.⁸⁸ Thus there seems to be little doubt of the hymnic characteristics of the passage. Assuming the danger of heresy at Colosse, it was admirably suited to stress the pre-eminence of Christ in creation and redemption, when this was being questioned.

3.2.4 Ephesians 2:14-17 uses Colossians 1:20.

Our passage clearly recalls Col. 1:15-20⁸⁹ but when we analyse it carefully we find that the real links with Eph. 2:14-17 are in v.20, e.g. the verb ἀποκατάλλασεν (which is only found in the New Testament in Colossians and Ephesians) εἰρηνοποιήσας τοῦ σταυροῦ (αἵματος also in v.13). There are only a few indirect indications of the remainder of the passage, such as references to creation, the body and the use of αὐτός. Col. 1:21, 22 have more parallels than Col. 1:15-19 ἐχθρὸς (σὲ νυνὶ with 13) ἀποκατήλλαξεν ἐν τῷ σώματι τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ.

If we assume that Ephesians is later than Colossians, we must either say that Ephesians uses the passage, the same author used his own topics in both instances or that both writings use an underlying Grundschrift. Most likely Ephesians 2:14-17 uses Col. 1:20 and verses 21, 22. But we cannot say it uses Col. 1:15-19. Nor can we say Eph. 2:14-17 is a third verse of the Colossian hymn. Any parallels in thought and word which can be found in Ephesians 2:14-17 are not in the Colossian passage. Gnostic hymns are also different.⁹⁰

3.2.5 The unlikelihood of Ephesians 2:14-17 being a hymn is revealed by the contradictory suggestions that have been made.

In favour of the hymnic hypothesis is the $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ of 2:14 which shows the passage could be a carefully compiled section or a hymn (cf. $\acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha\ \sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu$ in v.19). This is not definite, however, because $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ can be projected forward with the meaning "He is our peace, because he has made us one". Also in favour of a hymn are the unusual terminology, parallel phrases and hapax legomena. However the citation is co-ordinated to the context, since one citation of Isaiah 57 (Eph. 2:13) is in the text and the other 2:17 in the suggested hymn.⁹¹ Inner criteria, when applied to Ephesians 2, are, as we have seen, very subjective and we shall proceed to show how different the suggested reconstructions are. We cannot be sure that we have liturgy rather than letter.

The suggestion of a hymn is not really new. Bengel spoke of the verses' hymnlike quality.⁹² He found a symmetry between 2:14-15a (the uniting of Gentiles with Israel) and 15b-18 (the uniting of both Jews and Gentiles with God). Each part first tells of the ending of hostility and then of the preaching of the gospel. However to get this symmetry he had to take $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \sigma\acute{o}\zeta\eta\sigma\epsilon\iota$ as referring to Christian law wrought by Christ.

It is during this century that the real interest in the hymnic passage has begun and we have to concede and agree with Barth that hymnic traits are more obvious and complete than in most other suggested hymnic passages of Ephesians. There is the "we" style, the introduction by $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ and if 18 is included the prose resumed by/

47.

by ἄρα οὖν . It is Christological, has participles and relatives, synonyms and parallelisms.

3.2.5.1 H. Schlier

Although Dibelius⁹³ and others suggested an excursus, H. Schlier is largely responsible for the interest in hymnic possibilities for this passage, particularly in the way he inspired G. Schille to try and work out the actual verses.⁹⁴ Schlier in his earlier work thought it was simply an excursus and the author of Ephesians' own version of the underlying Gnostic myth but in his commentary he accepts with reserve the thesis of Schille that there is an underlying hymn or hymn fragment.⁹⁵ Ephesians is an offspring of the Hellenistic oriental Syrian world. Evidence is found in allusions to the cosmic barrier, the ascent of the redeemer, the body-head relationship, man, building and heavenly marriage. Some of these ideas are in the hymn, others are in the rest of Ephesians.

In his commentary he links the ideas, not so much with gnostic ideas like those of the second century, as he had done in his first major work on Ephesians in 1930, but with "gnostisierenden Judentum".⁹⁶ The background is not Greek mythology and Platonic myth but an early form of gnosticism which has links with the primal man redeemer myth of eastern (Jewish) gnosticism and perhaps mythical ideas which were also used in the mystery religions. Chronologically this is much more satisfactory, but as regards content it is not so easy to link the teaching of cosmic reconciliation to Jewish Wisdom or apocalyptic literature.⁹⁷

Schlier notices the apparent conscious stylization and rhythm which gives the impression of intentional composition. But he avoids the difficulties that arise when trying to put the passage into strophes, since he does not attempt this in great detail.⁹⁸ He gives a basic outline of a main clause speaking about peace, which has three participial clauses attached to it. The second section consists of two parallel final clauses, each of which has a participial clause attached. The third part beginning with καὶ ἐλθὲν leads to the quotation from Isaiah. This part also stresses the message in a positive manner, compared with the two earlier parts which show the negative ways in which peace has been achieved.

3.2.5.2 G. Schille

The task of carefully putting the hymn into lines fell to Schille.⁹⁹ Whereas Schlier had only two stages, the gnostic myth and the transforming of it by the author of Ephesians, Schille has three stages, the gnostic myth, the church's use of it in composing a hymn in praise of Christ reconciling man with God and finally the author's interpretation of this hymn to proclaim the reconciliation between Jews and Gentiles. The hymn has the character of a confession of faith.

Schille finds many baptismal fragments in Ephesians, e.g. 1:3-12 is an initiation song, 17-22 a prayer, 2:4-10 a reconciliation hymn in a baptismal context, 14-18 is a redeemer song¹⁰⁰ or cross triumph song inspired by the Israelite Gattung of the individual song of thanksgiving (p.80). The redeemer song is a creation of the Christian Community used at Baptism. He notices the "we" style, participles (p.48), synonyms in 15a and the parallels in 14b/15 and 15b/16. Γάρ introduces the quotation and the following scheme is suggested:

- αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ εἰρήνη ἡμῶν
- a) ὁ ποιήσας τὰ ἀρμότερα ἐν καὶ τὸ μεσότοιχον τοῦ φραγμοῦ λύσας
 - b) ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ τὸν νόμον τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐν Σόφρῳσι καταργήσας
 - a) ἵνα τοὺς δύο κτίσῃ ἐν αὐτῇ εἰς ἓνα καινὸν ἄνθρωπον, ποίῳν εἰρήνην
 - b) καὶ ἀποκαταλλάξῃ τοὺς ἀρμωτέρους ἐν ἑνὶ σώματι τῷ θεῷ (ὁὖν τῷ σταυρῷ)
 - a) καὶ ἔλθῃν εὐαγγελίσασθαι εἰρήνην ὑμῖν τοῖς μακρὰν καὶ εἰρήνην τοῖς ἐγγύς
 - b) ὅτι δι' αὐτοῦ ἔχαμεν τὴν προσαγγαγὴν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα

This provides a theme line, which is developed with three double lines, each relating to one of the three words, "he", "peace" and "our". The second double line is an example of "parallelismus membrorum". Schille believes that the lines as at present are clearly overcrowded so he omits the γάρ (introductory) τὴν ἔχθραν, ἀποκτείνων τὴν ἔχθραν ἐν αὐτῷ, ὑμῖν, ἀρμωτέροι ἐν ἑνὶ πνεύματι. These are removed for stylistic rhythmic reasons and through the change of the parties involved in reconciliation (pp. 26 and 28). As in Phil. 2:6-11 the song begins with the redeemer and ends with the Father (p.31). Since it talks of descent and return, the end is linked with the beginning as a ring composition, but with most stress on the victory and therefore the end of the song.

Schille's structure seems good, with a theme line and three double lines, but his first is really a double line¹⁰¹ and the average number of syllables in a line is rather long, 9-12 compared with 4-9 in the suggested hymn of Phil. 2.¹⁰² The lines are too long for normal poetry and the sentence construction is prose style. 14-16 is one long sentence. However the fact that the hymn uses the relative, participles and final clauses, does give the impression of being in practice several sentences strung together, although really one sentence from a grammatical point of view. In similar manner, Col. 1 vv. 15-18 are really part of the sentence beginning in v.9 and Phil. 2:6-8 and 9-11 form two sentences.

Merklein has pointed out the more serious weaknesses.¹⁰³ The suggested early Christian hymn when it is isolated from Ephesians by Schille hardly makes sense. "Both" and "two" are left without any antecedent.

If we assume that the two refer to God and man (or God and all living beings) does the hymn mean that Christ makes God and man into one body? What has law to do with this? How does Christ preach and to whom does the phrase "afar and near" refer?

Schille believes that the glosses which the author uses to interpret the hymn can be identified on literary grounds, but why have others not agreed with him? Schille's reconstruction is thus open to doubt, particularly when we note the different content of the hymn as proposed by Sanders and Gniska.

3.2.5.3 J.T. Sanders

His work The New Testament Christological Hymns approaches Ephesians via the assumption that the New Testament does contain Christological Hymns. He lists them uncritically from Phil. 2: 6-11, Col. 1:15-20, Eph. 2:14-16, 1 Tim. 3:16, 1 Pet. 3:18-22, Heb. 1 and the Johannine Prologue. Having taken for granted that Norden, Kroll and their successors are correct in their judgement that Christological hymns are distinct from other more obvious hymns, such as the Lukan ones, he does not investigate whether there are other hymns embedded in the New Testament. Yet he investigates the Odes of Solomon and Nag Hammadi writings. He first gives carefully suggested formal analyses of the hymns and then/

then discusses in turn their religious background which includes terminology dealing with cosmic creation and redemption, derived from outside the Old Testament.

However in his earlier ZNW article¹⁰⁴ he did consider other possible hymnic passages 1:13-14, 20-23, 3:20-21 and in his attempt at restoring the hymn tried to be minimal rather than definitive, including only what was extremely likely to be part of it.¹⁰⁵ He only includes 14-16, omitting the quotation in 17 from Isaiah. His reasoning is basically as Schille, e.g. the cosmic language shared with non-biblical writers, the difference from the context in style and language and the evidence of correction and interpretative material in the text. Yet he differs from Schille not only in the omission of v.17 but in retaining "γάρ". He omits on formal grounds "and making peace" "through the cross", which Schille thinks perhaps ought to be included. He also omits Schille's long second line "having abolished in his flesh, the law of commandments in ordinances". He takes Schille's first long line as two short ones which make a couplet. We have therefore a theme line

αὐτὸς γάρ ἐστιν ἡ εἰρήνῃ ἡμῶν
a) ὁ ποιήσας τὰ ἀρμότερα ἐν

b) καὶ τὸ μεσότοιχον τοῦ φραγμοῦ λύσας (τὴν ἐχθραν)

a) ἵνα τοὺς δύο κτίσῃ ἐν αὐτῷ εἰς ἓνα καινὸν ἄνθρωπον

b) καὶ ἀποκαταλλάξῃ τοὺς ἀρμότερους ἐν ἐνὶ σῶματι
τῷ θεῷ

Good points are -

- a) He keeps the hymn to one kind of relationship (presumably the vertical one).
- b) He links vv. 17 and 13, whereby 17 resumes the normal flow of the argument.
- c) In his second couplet, both lines have the subjunctive.
- d) Ποιήσας at the beginning of a line and another participle λύσας at the end of the next line which seems to be a good poetic trait.

Moreover by having a shorter passage, he does not encounter so many difficulties as a longer passage entails. The longer a suggested hymnic passage the more difficult it is to show a consistency of pattern/

pattern throughout. Reasons as compelling as those Sanders puts forward could be found for removing the lines that still remain in his hymnic reconstruction. Why keep a reference to peace at the outset, when you have already removed those referring to enmity? Why keep two participles but remove two others *καταργήσας, ἀποκτείνας* ? Moreover when one discovers a shorter extract, it means that the passage as a whole loses its sense of wholeness. For example "both" and "two" are left with no context.¹⁰⁶ He still has the problem of both a neuter *ἀρρότερα* and a masculine *ἀρροτέρους* in what is now an even closer proximity. It is not surprising therefore that he conjectures a previous verse on the Redeemer's participation in creation.

3.2.5.4 J. Gnilka

Gnilka has an article in the Schlier Festschrift as well as a section in his commentary dealing with the hymn.¹⁰⁷ Fundamental for him are the theological considerations, but form is also important.¹⁰⁸ He suggests that the original hymn which used cosmic concepts was not Gnostic but about Christ as the peace¹⁰⁹ of the entire universe who descends and ascends as in Philippians and Colossians. This was a theme with which the author of Ephesians (who was not Paul) agreed. However the hymn as it stood was far too general and not sufficiently historical or personal. The writer therefore adds phrases and references to Jews and Gentiles and shows that peace involved the cross. Gnilka prefers to see a non-gnostic background¹¹⁰ with a basis in Jewish cosmic concepts of a separating wall (cf. Enoch 14:9). This background originated in the Hellenistic synagogue where the law was regarded as a fence to Israel. The neuter word "both" shows an original reference to spheres. The redeemer breached the barrier between them on his descent¹¹¹ so that those below might follow him in his ascent. The flesh relates to Christ becoming man and his humanity. Christ descends, breaking through the barrier to form a new man from those imprisoned below.

Gnilka notices the four Ephesian hapax legomena, but realises that Ephesians is a short work. The formula *ἐν αὐτῷ* is claimed to have no parallel in the epistle and must be taken as a reflexive.¹¹² The "new man" which Christ forms in himself is different from the new/

new man 4:24 and has no analogy in the letter (p.195). "In his flesh" is not found elsewhere in Ephesians, and Christ not God is the subject of the passage, which is similar to 1 Tim. 3:16.

These observations are certainly objective ones. They are not the result of mutilating the text through theological or literary considerations. But on the basis of these observations, Gniska does proceed to extract a hymn from the text as follows:¹¹³

- 1a) αὐτὸς ἐστὶν ὁ εἰρήνη ἡμῶν
- 1b) ὁ ποιήσας τὰ ἀρμότερα ἐν
- 2a) καὶ τὸ μεσότοιχον λυσάς
- 2b) τὴν ἔχθραν ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ καταργήσας
- 3a) ἵνα κτισθῇ ἐν αὐτῷ καινὸν ἄνθρωπον
- 3b) ποιῶν εἰρήνην
- 4a) ἀποκτείνας τὴν ἔχθραν ἐν αὐτῷ
- 4b) καὶ ἔλθων εὐηγγελίσαστο εἰρήνην

Verse 17 is the interpretation (τοῖς μακρὰν καὶ τοῖς ἐγγύς).

He has discovered four double lines, each double line being a parallel, or possibly three double lines (1b and 2a, 2b and 3ab, 4a and 4b). In this scheme "making peace" becomes part of the previous line. 1a) is the introductory theme line.

He can thus find a simple structure, with a participle in every line except the fifth, which suggests "that he might create in him one new man" is deemed important.

The hymn as it stands in the present text is overloaded, e.g. the words "to the far and to the near" have been added. Gniska also omits γάρ, the article before εἰρήνη, τοῦ φραγμοῦ a large section αὐτοῦ - δόγμασι.. δύο, ἀρμότερους and another large section καὶ - σταυροῦ.

In Gniska's favour are:

- a) The lines average the same length apart from ποιῶν εἰρήνην but he obtains them at the cost of large scale omissions.
- b)/

- b) There is only one kind of barrier, namely between above and below.
- c) His passage has many hymnic characteristics.

We must leave the theological problems to our exegesis, but there are weaknesses on formal grounds.

- a) Parallelism could be found in other ways, e.g. by taking "he is our peace" as the theme line and then having four parallels. The fact that there is so much repetition of thought in the passage can make parallels easy to find, especially if you start omitting words. Gniska's song is neat and tidy, not because he has taken one or two verses only but through taking sections of a large number of verses. He has cut the Gordian knot, not once but several times. He has not simply removed words but also large sections from 2b and between 3b and 4a, which would completely spoil his scheme.
- b) Line 3b is much too short.
- c) He argues from the fact that Christ is the subject. Yet 1:3-14 has often been regarded as having a hymnic tradition and God is the subject there.
- d) He says $\epsilon\upsilon\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\hat{\omega}$ is different in meaning from "in Christ" elsewhere in the epistle. But why must it have exactly the same meaning as a similar yet different phrase? $\alpha\upsilon\tau\hat{\omega}\varsigma$ is a very common word. It is found in 4:10, 11 and 5:23. The fact that the meaning is different could be the very reason why he says $\epsilon\upsilon\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\hat{\omega}$ and not $\epsilon\upsilon\ \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\hat{\omega}$. Besides if Gniska is correct that the author of Ephesians is not Paul, then it is not necessary that $\epsilon\upsilon\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\hat{\omega}$ and $\epsilon\upsilon\ \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\hat{\omega}$ must mean the same.
- e) The section is really unintelligible without the rest of Ephesians. The context has to assume from Ephesians the descent and ascent (unless these are derived from Col.1:20-22).
- f) He omits reconciliation which is a theme found in Col.1:20, 21.
- g) He retains the "our" at the beginning, which would give the song in the first instance an historical meaning, with any cosmic meaning coming later. This is the reverse of how Schille envisages the order.
- h) He has participles following one after another, which is not the case in other suggested New Testament hymns.

- 1) He has omitted *φραγμοῦ* as being the type of addition which is characteristic of the author of Ephesians, whereas *φραγμοῦ* rather than *μεσότοιχον* is found in the suggested parallel passages.

Gnilka, therefore, while he has given valuable arguments for a cosmic background to the passage and the possibility of poetical language, has not succeeded in isolating a hymn from the context in a convincing manner. He has not recognized the exegetical unity of the whole passage and its links with Jewish exegesis of Isaiah 57:19.

3.2.5.5 Common Inclusions of Schille, Sanders and Gnilka.

They all include "He is our peace" (but only Sanders has "for") "who made one" "and destroyed the middle wall". Sanders and Schille add "of partition". All three have "that he might create in him, into new man" (Schille and Sanders say "one new man"). Only Schille and Gnilka have "coming he preached peace". It is strange that they all include *αὐτοῦ* and *ἡμῶν* both of which are less likely in a cosmological hymn than they would be in Ephesians. The two parts of the cosmos are not likely to refer to themselves together as "our" and *αὐτοῦ* is found throughout Ephesians 1:4,5 (of God) 6,7,8,9,10,12,14,18,19,20, 21,23, 2:4, 7,10,18,20, etc., and Col. 1:17, 18, etc.

3.2.5.6 Common Omissions.

They agree in omitting "through the cross" and "to you". Apart from these two phrases there is no part which none of them does not have. This provides powerful support for the unity of the passage as a whole, since such drastic measures as each of the three authors appears to take only agree in removing two small sections. Even when we include verse 18, they only omit "both in one spirit". It would therefore appear that the onus of proof is on those who would seek to show that this passage is not a unity, rather than on those who assume its integrity, irrespective of whether it had a previous history as a separate entity.

It/

It clearly has the same kind of thought as 2:12 and 3:6 which are found in close proximity on either side of the section. Less certain are possible connections with cosmic reconciliation in 1:10. The emphasis of the *σύν* in 2:5 and 6 is the unity with Christ, rather than of Gentile with Jew.

3.2.5.7 Alternative Suggestions.

The most detailed reconstruction in recent years has been that of Giovanni Giavini¹¹⁴ who traces further Schlier's analysis of 14-18. He extends it in both directions to include all the verses from 11-22. He finds a structure CBA X ABC. X is further subdivided abcd abcd.

C 11,12 (τῆς πολιτείας, ξένοι)

B 13 (μακρὰν, ἐγγύς)

A 14 For he is our peace (εἰρήνη)

a who has made us both one (ἀμφότερα, ἓν)

b and has broken down the dividing wall

c of hostility (τὴν ἔχθραν)

d in his flesh

e abolishing the law of commandments and ordinances

a that he might create in himself one new man in place of the two (τοὺς δύο, εἰς ἓνα)

b and might reconcile us both to God in one body through the cross

c thereby bringing the hostility to an end (τὴν ἔχθραν)

d in himself

A and he came and preached peace to you (εἰρήνην)

B who were far off and peace to those who were near. For through him we both have access in one spirit to the Father (μακρὰν, ἐγγύς)

C 19-22 (ξένοι, συμπολῖται)

This certainly gives remarkable parallels, but both his C's are long, with the second much longer than the former (more than five and/

and four lines respectively). In contrast to these, the A's are very short. His central section is abcdeabcd whereas we would expect, judging from the overall scheme, abcdedcba.

In spite of Giavini's claim to find the same structure in Col. 1: 12-20, the arrangement is an arbitrary one and there are no other parallels of this metre. On one side of "E" there are nearly seven and a half lines, but on the other side over ten. With such symmetry, most of us could discover that our prosaic writing has a structure. It is too much like the preacher who must find three points beginning with the same letter in his text. In Giavini's favour is that he does not emend the text to obtain the structure.

Klaus Wengst¹¹⁵ like Sanders and Kasemann restricts the hymn to 14-16 since style criticism suggests that verses 17 and 18 were written by the author of the letter. His outline is

αὐτὸς ἔστιν ἡ εἰρήνη ἡμῶν
ὁ ποιήσας τὰ ἀρμότερα ἐν

καὶ τὸ μεσότοιχον λύσας

ἵνα τοὺς δύο κτίσῃ ἐν αὐτῇ

εἰς ἓνα καινὸν ἄνθρωπον, ποιῶν εἰρήνην

καὶ ἀποκαταλλάξῃ τοὺς κρυπτότεροὺς τῇ θεῷ διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ

ἀποκτείνας τὴν ἐχθρὰν ἐν αὐτῇ

Wengst (p.186) calls it a reconciliation song used by Gentile Christians being part of a two part creation-mediator Enthronement song, like Col. 1:15-20. The song originally had no soteriology but merely a cipher allusion to the cross of the Christ in the reconciliation with God of the heavenly powers and earthly men through the universal man Christ.

Ephesians takes this song and relates it to the uniting of Jew and Gentile in Christ and their relationship with God. The author makes additions to the text and interprets soteriologically and ecclesiologically.

It is not easy to see how Wengst can claim that it is like Col.1: 15-20 since little of that passage is found here. He also removes/

removes some of what they have in common, e.g. "body". The hymn in its present form has a large number of additions γάρ, τοῦ φραγροῦ, τὴν ἔχθραν.... καταργήσας, ἐν ἐνὶ σωματί.

The evidence he uses is one-sided. Dibelius and Schlier are cited for gnostic evidence but he ignores the Letter of Aristeas and messianic exegesis of Is. 57:19, 9:5f, 52:7 which support a Jewish background.¹¹⁶ His contribution has added very little to what has been said by Schille and Sanders except in retaining a reference to the cross. Since he says it has no real soteriological meaning, he would have been consistent in omitting this word particularly since it makes that line of the hymn far too long.

K.M. Fischer finds a hymn which has been adapted.¹¹⁷ His thesis is that Ephesians belongs to the period between the group of churches' loss of Pauline authority and links with the Jerusalem community on the one hand and the threat from Catholicism on the other. It is not "early catholicism" for the church writer wishes to resist this catholicizing of his community, which still knows only local elders and deacons. Fischer is here using the argument of silence. The group could have had one leading bishop as well as the other bishops.

In the course of his letter, the author uses a gnostic hymn on the redeemer to which he adds the thought of the cross. The original hymn was:-

αὐτὸς ἐστὶν ἡ εἰρήνη ἡμῶν ὁ ποιήσας τὰ ἀρφότερα ἐν
καὶ τὸ ρεσότοιχον (τοῦ φραγροῦ) λύσας, τὴν ἔχθραν καταργήσας
καὶ ἐλθὼν εὐηγγελίσατο εἰρήνην τοῖς μακρὰν καὶ τοῖς ἐγγύς

This, says Fischer, is a fragment from a gnostic redeemer song, depicting a wall between the heavenly and earthly world. The original cosmic reference now refers to the reconciliation of Jew and Gentile in the Church. This is certainly a very brief quotation but Fischer does not claim it to be complete. In favour of its hymnic character are the poetic clues of γάρ, ἡμῶν and the change from neuter to masculine and three lines with participle. The brevity of the citation means that the whole passage can hardly be called a hymn.

A. Lindemann only includes the first part as far as τὴν ἔχθραν, the section καταργήσας.. ποιῶν εἰρήνην and ἀποκτείνας τὴν ἔχθραν ἐν αὐτῇ with the possibility of verse 17.¹¹⁸

N. Perrin omits γάρ, τὴν ἔχθραν, ποιῶν εἰρήνην and διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ¹¹⁹

Schille	Sanders	Gnilka	Fischer	Perrin	Wengst	Lindemann
αὐτός	αὐτός	αὐτός	αὐτός	αὐτός	αὐτός	αὐτός
ἔστιν	ἔστιν	ἔστιν	ἔστιν	ἔστιν	ἔστιν	ἔστιν
ἡ εἰρήνη	ἡ εἰρήνη	ἡ εἰρήνη	ἡ εἰρήνη	ἡ εἰρήνη	ἡ εἰρήνη	ἡ εἰρήνη
ἡμῶν	ἡμῶν	ἡμῶν	ἡμῶν	ἡμῶν	ἡμῶν	ἡμῶν
ὁ ποιήσας	ὁ ποιήσας	ὁ ποιήσας	ὁ ποιήσας	ὁ ποιήσας	ὁ ποιήσας	ὁ ποιήσας
τὰ	τὰ	τὰ	τὰ	τὰ	τὰ	τὰ
ἀρμότερα	ἀρμότερα	ἀρμότερα	ἀρμότερα	ἀρμότερα	ἀρμότερα	ἀρμότερα
ἐν	ἐν	ἐν	ἐν	ἐν	ἐν	ἐν
καὶ τὸ	καὶ τὸ	καὶ τὸ	καὶ τὸ	καὶ τὸ	καὶ τὸ	καὶ τὸ
μεσότοιχον	μεσότοιχον	μεσότοιχον	μεσότοιχον	μεσότοιχον	μεσότοιχον	μεσότοιχον
τοῦ	τοῦ			τοῦ		τοῦ
φραγμοῦ	φραγμοῦ			φραγμοῦ		φραγμοῦ
λύσας	λύσας	λύσας	λύσας	λύσας	λύσας	λύσας
ἐν τῇ σαρκί	(τὴν ἐχθραν)	τὴν ἐχθραν	τὴν ἐχθραν	ἐν τῇ σαρκί		τὴν ἐχθραν
αὐτοῦ				αὐτοῦ		
τὸν νόμον				τὸν νόμον		
τῶν ἐντολῶν				τῶν ἐντολῶν		
ἐν δόγματι				ἐν δόγματι		
καταργήσας		καταργήσας	καταργήσας	καταργήσας		καταργήσας
ἵνα τοὺς	ἵνα τοὺς	ἵνα τοὺς		ἵνα τοὺς	ἵνα τοὺς	ἵνα τοὺς
δύο	δύο	δύο		δύο	δύο	δύο
κτίσῃ	κτίσῃ	κτίσῃ		κτίσῃ	κτίσῃ	κτίσῃ
ἐν αὐτῷ	ἐν αὐτῷ	ἐν αὐτῷ		ἐν αὐτῷ	ἐν αὐτῷ	ἐν αὐτῷ
εἰς ἓνα	εἰς ἓνα			εἰς ἓνα	εἰς ἓνα	εἰς ἓνα
καὶνὸν	καὶνὸν	καὶνὸν		καὶνὸν	καὶνὸν	καὶνὸν
ἀνθρώπων	ἀνθρώπων	ἀνθρώπων		ἀνθρώπων	ἀνθρώπων	ἀνθρώπων
ποιῶν	ποιῶν	ποιῶν		ποιῶν	ποιῶν	ποιῶν
εἰρήνην	εἰρήνην	εἰρήνην		εἰρήνην	εἰρήνην	εἰρήνην
καὶ	καὶ			καὶ	καὶ	
ἀποκαταλλάξῃ	ἀποκαταλλάξῃ			ἀποκαταλλάξῃ	ἀποκαταλλάξῃ	
τοὺς	τοὺς			τοὺς	τοὺς	
ἀρμότερους	ἀρμότερους			ἀρμότερους	ἀρμότερους	
ἐν ἐνι	ἐν ἐνι			ἐν ἐνι	ἐν ἐνι	
σώματι	σώματι			σώματι	σώματι	
τῷ θεῷ	τῷ θεῷ			τῷ θεῷ	τῷ θεῷ	
		ἀποκτείνας		ἀποκτείνας	ἀποκτείνας	ἀποκτείνας
		τὴν ἐχθραν		τὴν ἐχθραν	τὴν ἐχθραν	τὴν ἐχθραν
		ἐν αὐτῷ		ἐν αὐτῷ	ἐν αὐτῷ	ἐν αὐτῷ
καὶ ἐλθὼν		καὶ ἐλθὼν	καὶ ἐλθὼν			
εὐαγγελί-		εὐαγγελί-	εὐαγγελί-			
σάτο		σάτο	σάτο			
εἰρήνην		εἰρήνην	εἰρήνην			
τοῖς	(None have	ὑμῖν)	τοῖς			
μακρὰν			μακρὰν			
καὶ			καὶ			
εἰρήνην			εἰρήνην			
τοῖς			τοῖς			
ἐγγύς			ἐγγύς			
						↑ P O S S I B I L E ↓

3.2.5.8 Summary

All of the seven authors included in the chart (p.59) have αὐτὸς ἔστιν ἡ εἰρήνη ἡ ἡμῶν, ὁ ποιήσας τὰ ἐμφώτερα ἔν καὶ τὸ μεσότοιχον λύσας and all omit ὑμῖν . All except one omit γάρ (Sanders) and Σὺν τοῦ σταυροῦ (Wengst). All except Fischer have ἵνα τοὺς δύο κτίση ἐν αὐτῷ εἰς ἓνα.

They all agree that there is something poetical about the first part of the passage, where three short lines can be found. This appears to confirm their belief that a hymn can be found. But the difference in what they include from the following verses makes it very debatable. Not many include the latter part of verse 17.

3.2.6 J.C. Kirby

Another way of looking at the passage is to find liturgical forms over a wider area, in the way that 1 Peter has been studied. J.C. Kirby has found a carefully structured section. He believes that the whole book to which only a few epistolary sections have been added contains the substance of the Pentecost worship service. He thinks that by the time of Paul such a service had already evolved out of Judaism (cf. IQS1f). Chapters 1-3 suggest a Berakhah for public worship (58) and the theme of baptism can be traced throughout the epistle. 2:11-22 in particular uses Jewish teaching on proselyte baptism,¹²⁰ and is a distinct unity, probably composed independently (p.189) but 1:3-14 and ch. 2 and 3:14-21 do have the same theme, namely what God has done for believers and what he still may do. 1:3-9 is the opening with blessings enumerated; 10-14 show the divine plan for the world. The dead have been raised (2:1-10), the alien has been enfranchised (2:11-22), 3:14-19 is the prayer for the deeper understanding of the love of Christ, and 20-21 the doxology. Kirby justifies omitting 1:15-23 (Credal) and 3:1-13 (Eulogy) because they are clearly epistolary in form. Parallels with Paul would be the result of his forms of prayer being remembered and his way of leading worship would have been influenced by the synagogue.

Kirby's/

Kirby's suggestion of Berakhah and Pentecost connections seems very arbitrary, but he insists that all he has attempted to do is to take seriously the judgement of competent scholars that Ephesians is written in liturgical style and then seek to answer problems that the style raises. His outline for 2:11-22 has a chiasmic form A-K K-A, with the part which concerns us being as follows:-

- G But now in Christ Jesus, you once were far off.
- H Have been brought near in the blood of Christ.
- I For he is our peace, who has made us both one.
- J And has broken down the dividing wall of hostility.
- K By destroying in his flesh the law of commandments and ordinances.
- K That he might create in himself one new man in place of two.
- J So making peace and might reconcile both in one body to God through the cross.
- I Thereby bringing the hostility to an end.
- H And he came and preached peace to you who were far off.
- G And peace to those who were near.

The contrast is drawn by the use of contrasting words and ideas. The writer is giving a Christian Midrash on Is. 57:19 similar to Mid Bemidbar Rabba 8:4. Ephesians has expanded this thought to include the Gentiles.¹²¹

One agrees with Kirby that the writing definitely uses Is. 57 and expands the thought to include the Gentiles. But Kirby's scheme is somewhat debatable. He need only have one K (as Giavini 3.2.5.7). The thought of peace is found in I and the corresponding reference in G. His second J is excessively long and includes several ideas. "Far off" is in G and H, but "near" is in H and G.

He has no gaps and this overcomes the problem of glosses which Deichgräber was able to expose in Schille's reconstruction.¹²²

The extension of the poetical framework really weakens the argument of those who see in 14-17 a hymnic passage. The next stage would be to try and find a poetical structure for the whole book. This leads back to our suggestion that much of Ephesians is a kind of poetical language without necessarily being carefully constructed/

constructed poetry and that in 14-17 we have language inspired by two quotations, Col. 1:20 and Is. 57:19. The fervour of the verses might suggest a hymn, but Christians believe that their subject is worthy of lofty language. This however does not mean that they must be singing all the time and can have no other literature besides hymns. Prayers and Confessions need not always be poetical.

3.2.7 The passage is not a hymn.

Those who find an extended comment rather than a hymn seem nearer to the truth. Stuhlmacher discovers a Christological insertion in Ephesians in the form of an exegesis of Is. 57:19, 9:5 and 52:7.¹²³ These three passages have the link word, peace, which is used here Christologically. This is Messianic Christian exegesis. A rabbinical method has inspired Christological biblical exegesis.¹²⁴ Rather than follow Gnllka who tries to combine the cosmic gnostic thought of Schlier and Kasemann with the Old Testament approach of Percy and La Madrid, Stuhlmacher comes down on the side of the latter. But need it be either - or? Gnosticism had in part a Jewish background as Schlier now stresses. Gnostic exegesis must not be ignored.

The wide variations in the attempted recovery of the original hymn tell against the hymnic hypothesis. Participles in hymns usually have articles, which they do not have here. More seriously, Greek hymns which are cited in the New Testament (Acts 17:28 and Titus 1:12) are different, with very short lines, being complete sentences, with no participles, adjectives and nouns with genitive. Acts 17 has *γάρ* twice but in Eph. 2 some insist that "For" be omitted.

Eph. 2:14-17 is more like an extended comment¹²⁵ than a citation. The language of Ephesians as a whole is quite hymnic,¹²⁶ since we have noticed how frequently hymns are suggested for other passages.¹²⁷

3.2.8 The passage is based on a hymn used by Colossians.

It is better to regard Ephesians 2:14-17 as inspired by the hymn in Col. 1:15-20 than to seek to find an actual hymn.

This point of view can be held in different ways, e.g. as part of the same hymn, or as a hymn composed by the Ephesian author, which was inspired by Colossians. We have to acknowledge that research has shown there is something distinctive but that no satisfactory hymn has been found. In view of our discussion, it is probable that it was prompted in part by Col. 1:20. Scholars make the frequent assumption that Col. 1:15-20 is in the author's mind, but in fact it is only v.20 that Ephesians uses (reconcile, peace, cross). The only possible allusion to the remainder of the Colossian passage is "created".

But Ephesians 2:14-17 does use Col. 1:21, 22 as well. There the reconciliation is of human beings to God rather than the more cosmic emphasis of the earlier part. Colossians has already taken the reconciliation beyond the cosmic spatial idea to the more down to earth problem of Jewish-Gentile reconciliation. It is this theme that Eph. 2:14-17 develops. Col. 1:20 is the reconciliation of all things in one body. Ephesians like Col. 1:21, 22 thinks of the stage on the way, the reconciliation of humanity to God and among its members.

Our passage is inspired by Col. 1:20, 22 which in turn was prompted by the quotation from Is. 57:19. These quotations inevitably give the whole the appearance of a quoted hymn.

3.3 Is the background Jewish, Gnostic or something else?

There is an obvious Jewish connection because of the use of the Old Testament, e.g. Isaiah. But the possibility must still be considered that gnostic phraseology is found in the terms. Gnostic ideas could be derived from the background of the Colossian hymn and be inspired by the heretical tendencies of the readers. Whether the background to any of the concepts or whether the general idea is gnostic will become clear in our exegesis, especially concerning the meaning of the middle wall.

3.4 Summary of the Chapter

A study has been made of verse 13 and of a possible hymnic structure in 14-17. The latter has been shown not to be the case, except in that the hymn in Col. 1:15-20 may have prompted the passage. The use of Col. 1:20, 21 and Isaiah provide a likely explanation. Nevertheless a background in non-Christian thought must be discussed as a possibility.

CHAPTER FOUR. EPHESIANS 2:14ab.

A simple and literal translation is "For he is our peace who made (first aorist active participle) both (i.e. Jew and Gentile) one and loosed (first aorist active participle) the dividing wall.

In English versions, verse 14 also contains the reference to "hostility". This assumes a comma after τὴν ἐχθρὰν rather than before it. But since we have not yet ascertained whether this hostility directly relates to the dividing wall or relates to words in v.15, which are dependent upon καταργήσας (see section 52), we shall leave discussion until the next chapter.

4.1 Γάρ

This conjunction is often seen as an indication of a possible hymnic passage but it is probably exegetical, explaining what has just been said in the previous verse. This is the case where γάρ is used in 5:6, 8, 14,¹ 29 and 6:1 and also in this chapter at vv. 8 and 10. In both these previous examples, γάρ is used to emphasize a word or idea which has just been mentioned and to introduce a clause which repeats that word or idea; e.g. 2:7 and 8 emphasize "grace" and 2:9 and 10 "work" (ἔργον and ποιήμα). Here in 2:14 γάρ links "brought near" of 2:13 and the subsequent clauses in 14ff.

The sentence structure of 2:10a and 2:14a is very similar with the emphasis upon Christ at the beginning and the use of the verb εἰρήνη.²

4.1.1 Αὐτός

This is clearly a reference to Christ.³ The antecedent is Χριστοῦ or Χριστῷ in v.13.⁴ Αὐτός need not have been expressed in the sentence as it is implied in the verb ἐστίν although admittedly without it the sentence is rather odd. But the fact that it is written with a position at the beginning of the sentence, and the fact that "peace" has the article, suggest that it is meant to be emphasized as in v.10.⁵ The significance of this emphasis could imply :

(a) That it is he and no other (as Salmond).

If/

If Ephesians were read at Colosse the readers would understand it in this way. No other intermediary is needed. He has the pre-eminence (Col. 1:18). Ephesians 2 emphasizes who Christ is and what he does. *Χριστός* occurs no less than eight times (although never in the nominative) and in addition *αὐτός* is used four times of Christ (and possibly *αὐτῷ* in 15 and 16). God may be the origin of salvation, but all salvation is realised exclusively in and through Christ.⁶

(b) An emphatic *αὐτός* could have the meaning "he himself"⁷ like John 9:21, 16:27 and 14:6, 7. He is our peace, not because he is merely the agent of someone else. He performs the work of peace directly.⁸

(c) He, in his own person.⁹

It is not a system nor a philosophy that provides peace, but a person.¹⁰

(d) He is our peace.

"He did not make our peace and then retire, leaving us to enjoy that peace, but is himself its medium and substance."¹¹ We form in him a new man and one body.

(e) "He" can be emphasized to show that it is a reference to the one who would preach to the far and near.¹²

(f) "He, not ourselves (not any of us) is our peace".

This is unlikely to be the meaning. Certainly *ἑμῶν* is found in the passage, but the writer would not contemplate the possibility that he himself, or Jews, or anyone apart from Christ could provide this peace for us.

(g) To show that Christ is the subject rather than God, which was the case in the earlier part of the chapter.

(h) To stress the certainty and completeness of the blessings obtained.

It is an absolute peace, because he is our peace.¹³

(i) To show that peace is bound up with him and is inseparable from him.¹⁴

(j)/

(j) To introduce and hold together the general theme of the passage.¹⁵

All of these possibilities except (f) can be accepted. The writer is summing up all he is going to tell us in the passage. "He" is the subject of the participles and aorist verbs in the following verses. "Thus the writer sums up briefly and trenchantly the theme that he is about to expound."¹⁶ Christ is the mediator of peace, as in Rom. 5:1, Col. 1:20.¹⁷

The author may have preferred $\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ to $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ since $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ would have appeared in this context to be too Jewish, reminding of the messianic exclusiveness and thus weaken the argument. $\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ therefore refers to Jesus, rather than to Christ.

4.1.2 ἡμεῖς

The English language does not distinguish between an inclusive and an exclusive first person plural. Here it is probably inclusive,¹⁸ including the writer and all his readers, rather than an exclusive "we" of Jews only. It is no longer a case of "them and us" for Christ is the peace for Jew and Gentile. To use in an exclusive sense in this passage would be to re-erect the barrier he is claiming has been removed. It is true until now that only Jews had the blessings enumerated in ch. 1, whereas Gentiles were "strangers to the covenant".¹⁹ But Ephesians is showing that God had his plan all the time, although only now revealed that Gentiles were fellow heirs. When "we" is meant to be taken exclusively this is made clear (e.g. 1:12). Our passage shows it is inclusive, since it is linked with both-one, as is also the case in v.18.

The references to "we" and "you" in Ephesians are not always clear. "We" is found in 1:3-12, 14 and "you" in 1:13. "We" could mean Jewish-Christians and "you" refer to Gentiles and the recipients of the letter. But it could possibly be two groups of Christians.²⁰ Percy distinguishes between those who have been converted for a long time and recent converts.²¹

In 2:11, "you" is clearly Gentile Christians, but it never actually says that "we" refers to both Jew and Gentile. In 2:18 it would seem to refer to all including the author and it is so here in 2:14.

There/

There is clearly a change of person at this stage. It has been the second person throughout the chapter, except v.10. The first person is now employed, since the passage is about unity. The only second person in 2:14-17 occurs in the quotation from Isaiah. But there is a return to the second person in 19-22. This is essential for the sense of the passage. If we substitute *ἡμεῖς* v. 19ff become contradictory.

The plural scene is set by the parallels "near and far" in v.13 which prepare the way for the "both" and "the two".

"Our peace" recalls Col. 3:4, where Christ is spoken of as "our life".²² Since men are in Christ, they have peace. life, etc.

4.2 ἡ εἰρήνη

4.2.1 Why is the term used?

- a) It is an appropriate term because the writer is referring to one who kills enmity, reconciles parties and makes two into one. Christ is also the peace, because he makes peace (16) and preaches peace (17). But these last two ideas are probably inspired by the fact that he has already said that Christ is our peace.²³ Similarly Col. 1:27 calls Christ the hope, because of the reference to the brighter prospects of the Gentiles.
- b) The term is probably prompted by the quotations from Col. 1:20 and Is. 57:19. The latter passage goes on to say that the wicked are like a troubled sea which cannot rest, that there is no peace for the wicked (cf. Eph. 4:14).
- c) If we had found a hymn in 14-17, we would have explained that the writer felt the hymn was appropriate for his argument and this was how the hymn happened to begin. It was a hymn of peace.

4.2.2 Grammatical Possibilities.

- a) The noun has the article. It would therefore appear that as Christ is emphasized, so the peace is also stressed. This is probable, /

probable, but we must not build too much on it, for there are New Testament passages, where a quality is stressed, which have no article; e.g. in Eph. 6:23 and 24 grace has the article but not peace (cf. ἀληθείας 2 Tim. 2:25, 3:7, Titus 1:1, Heb. 10:26, see also 3 John 1 and 3).

- b) Christ is introduced as the peace in the fullest possible manner; no particular aspect is emphasized to the exclusion of others. We are not required to decide which of the two aspects of peace is in mind, whether between Jew and Gentile²⁴ or with God,²⁵ nor if it is peace in the church, the world, universe or conscience. Christ is our peace absolutely. In the passage that follows, two aspects are dealt with in turn, first peace between Jew and Gentile and secondly peace between God and men.
- c) The article could be equivalent to the demonstrative pronoun and therefore have the meaning "for he is this peace of ours."
- d) "For he is our peace" introduces a series of participial clauses. It is possible therefore to understand ὁ εἰρήνη in the same way, expressing what would normally require a relative clause. "He who is peace" (cf. Acts 13:9) or, "for he is the one who is our peace".

4.2.2.1 He is our peace offering.

This is a possible interpretation²⁶ because:-

- i) ἁμαρτία can be used for the sin offering (Lev. 4:8 and possibly 2 Cor. 5:21) so presumably peace can be used to mean the peace offering.
- ii) The context of the passage is sacrificial. The LXX equivalents for $\alpha\lambda\lambda\omega$ are σωτηρία and εἰρηνικη.

But is unlikely because:-

- i) It is using an uncertainty to prove another uncertainty. It is by no means certain that 2 Cor. 5:21 is a reference to "sin offering", ἁμαρτία occurs twice elsewhere in the same passage and in neither case can it mean sin-offering. This meaning has been suggested because of the difficulty of saying Christ was made sin. There is no such difficulty here and peace in 2:15 and 17 means peace, not peace-offering.

ii) We have εἰρήνη not εἰρηνική which the LXX distinguishes. The LXX is careful to translate $\text{D. } \dot{\rho} \dot{\psi}$ by εἰρηνική not εἰρήνη

iiia) The context is hardly sacrificial. There is no other explicit cultic reference in the passage before v.22.²⁷

There is no reference to sin, priest or sacrifice.

4.2.3 Passages and incidents which would suggest and colour the author's use of the word peace.

4.2.3.1 Ephesians

We must notice how the author uses the term elsewhere. 1:2 has the usual greeting and benediction found in Paul and other New Testament authors (cf. 6:23). Every Pauline epistle has the word peace in its greeting including the Pastorals as well as 1 Pet., 2 Pet., 2 Jn. and Jude. This natural Hebrew greeting was an attractive one for Christians to adopt and give a fuller meaning. The fact that Gentile Christians used this Jewish term was an indication that they understood the barrier has been broken down.

Assuming peace is a concept with certain connotations in the author's mind, 6:15 becomes more significant. The context depicts the Christian as assailed by spiritual powers and needing to be armed with spiritual armour. His breastplate is righteousness and his shoes are the readiness to proclaim the gospel of peace²⁸ or the victory that has brought peace.²⁹

In a captivity epistle (3:1 and 4:1) the illustration of armour may be prompted by Roman legions or by the guards of the author. But the writer who cites Isaiah elsewhere would also be reminded of Isaiah 52:7 (especially when using the LXX) which mentions the feet of the messenger who publishes peace and tells the watchman to sing for joy. The context is also applicable (v.10) since it depicts all the nations seeing God. This text is also found in Nahum 2:1 (Hebrew) but oneness is depicted there as the result of the destruction of the wicked. The Isaiah background is very interesting, since Eph. 6:14 speaks of truth and girdle, recalling Is. 11:5 where righteousness is a girdle. Eph. 6:17 and 1 Thess. 5:8 are the only New Testament references to περιεφλάειν and both/

both are inspired by Is. 59:17.

A war is on against the principalities and powers, whom the Gentiles used to follow (2:2) and even now must fight against (6:12). The writer may not have believed in them literally, but he believed in the Satanic powers, which lay behind them (5:11).

In 4:3 he urges an outworking of peace and unity. Peace is thus a subject which the author uses frequently. But it is more likely that his use of peace in our passage coloured what he writes in later chapters rather than the reverse. He is not the kind of author who knows in chapter two what he will be writing in chapter six, unless he altered his earlier part in the light of what he wrote afterwards.

4.2.3.2 Colossians

Since this is either an earlier work by the same author, or is used by him, ideas of peace that are found here would be likely to affect what he says in Ephesians. We have already suggested that 1:20 inspired our passage.

In 2:15 peace is achieved by Christ disarming the principalities and powers. The verb ἀπεκδύεσθαι is not known before Paul. Ἐκδύν (2 Cor. 5:4) and ἀποδύν mean to strip. Here we have the two prepositions together (cf. Col. 3:9) presumably giving greater emphasis. The verb is middle and many early writings took it literally, "having put off from himself the hostile powers of evil".³⁰ The middle is difficult and it seems (J.B. Lightfoot's objections to the contrary) that Jerome was correct not to stress the middle.³¹ We can then translate as to spoil or to disarm, i.e. to strip the hostile powers of their weapons. For Paul, these evil powers were everything that is opposed to Christ, symbolised for the Colossians by the mediaries they were taught to fear. We need not say with Alford that these powers are angels who administered the law. The New Testament admittedly does speak of the inferiority of the law, since received through angels (Gal. 3:19 and Heb. 2:2), but it also sees it as superior for this very reason (Acts 7:53). It can scarcely be said that angels were made to look ridiculous. They acted after all as God's representatives. The powers seem to be those who used and abused the law to enslave men.

Col. 2:15 thus takes up the theme of Col. 1:15-17. Ephesians 2:14-17 takes up the thought of Col. 1:18, the human aspect of things on earth, and expounds this in terms of Jewish-Gentile relationships.³²

Col. 3:2 speaks of "above" where peace reigns, 3:11 of oneness with barbarian and Scythian, 3:14 of harmony and 3:15 of the peace of Christ. Like Ephesians, Colossians is concerned with peace, but deals with it more on a metaphysical rather than a social level. Metaphysical questions were clearly more of a problem in the Colossian situation than in the Ephesian one.

4.2.3.3 Paul

Whether or not Ephesians was written by Paul it is clearly influenced by his writings. The understanding of peace would therefore be likely to reflect Paul's.

The noun εἰρήνη is found forty-two times in Paul, including four in the Pastorals. It is found eleven times in Romans and eight times in Ephesians, so there is a much higher proportion in this epistle. The smaller writings would have a larger percentage since peace is regularly found in the introductions and in the benedictions. We have "Lord of peace" (2 Thess. 3:16). "God of peace" is found many times. Besides (a) its use in greetings and benedictions Paul can use it (b) in an objective sense (e.g. Rom. 5:1) of peace between man and God, or of peace between men (1 Thess. 5:13) or (c) in a subjective sense (within man, Phil. 4:7, Col. 3:15). Of these (b) is clearly relevant. But these divisions can be overdone, for the only way in which believers can enjoy peace with themselves and with others is when they are at peace with God.³³ H. Roux insists it is difficult if not impossible to distinguish these divisions because the Bible does not do so.³⁴ But clearly one aspect is emphasized at one time and then another. Paul's emphasis leans towards the objective understanding from which the other aspects of peace are derived. It is eschatological in that it is coming to fruition. It is the peace that is to reign when the "God of peace will soon crush Satan under the feet of his people" (Rom. 16:20). It therefore includes the Colossian theme of pacification of the powers hostile to God and the Ephesians theme of reconciliation between Jews and Gentiles.³⁵

4.2.3.4 The New Testament

'Ειρήνη is found in every book except 1 John. It is not likely to be used exactly in the Greek sense of the interruption of the normal conditions of war.³⁶ Its meaning would be coloured by its use in the LXX for וְשָׁלוֹם .³⁷ The LXX rarely uses it otherwise.³⁸ Thus the Greek word takes in a broader meaning and is used in a number of places in the Old Testament where it has nothing to do with war, e.g. prosperity (Judges 6:23), farewell (Judges 18:6) and ethical good (Ps. 34:14). 'Ειρήνη becomes more positive in the New Testament, sometimes even more than וְשָׁלוֹם in the Old Testament³⁹ and is related less to war, political peace and security and more to the restoration of amicable relations with God and of the mutual reconciliation between men.⁴⁰

Apart from Paul and the Pastorals, the New Testament has only thirty-seven references to peace and twenty-four of these are in the gospels. Foerster⁴¹ gives a list of its different meanings, but more important is the emphasis that a particular context can give to the word.

Like Ephesians, the gospels teach that Jesus came to bring peace on earth to men of goodwill (Lk. 2:14). The time of salvation has dawned. Jesus came not only for the Jews, but as a light to lighten the Gentiles and the glory of his people Israel (Lk. 2:32).

Because the coming of Jesus is misunderstood, it brings paradoxically a sword instead of peace (Mt. 10:34) and the cross is to be the means of achieving peace. At his temptation, Christ is in harmony with angels and wild beasts (Mk. 1:13).

In the Cornelius story, which breaks the barrier between Jew and Gentile, Peter mentions the preaching of peace (Acts 10:36, cf. John 20:21) and this is followed by the Holy Spirit being poured upon the Gentiles.

Peace in the New Testament is eschatological, referring to the end time Messianic peace (Lk. 2:14, 19:38, Acts 10:36, Heb. 7:2, Jas. 3:18), but it is also present because Christ has come. Through this eschatological event, demons have been overcome (cf. Mark's gospel/

gospel) and peace has also been given to individuals (Jn. 14:27). Jesus is now enthroned and takes people from the sphere of darkness into his Lordship (Col. 1:13). Jesus heals the breach in the cosmos (Col. 1:15-20) and between Jew and Gentile (Eph. 2:14-17).

It is necessary to remember how peace was understood in the world at the time of Ephesians. Modern semantic study has shown us that it is equally important, if not more so, to study the context and the meaning of the word in similarly structural passages, than to simply trace the history of the meaning of the word. A thorough investigation and use of modern semantic methods is found in M. Klemm, EIPHNH im neutestamentlichen Sprachsystem, Bonn 1977. The actual situation of the writer, the recipients, the type of sentence and outlay are all important. Klemm concedes that this type of approach to New Testament theology is not so new as it appears (p.92) and that it does not provide all the answers (p. 258ff). However when Klemm deals with our passage he is dependent upon Schlier for his conclusions rather than upon the methods he himself has outlined.

4.2.3.5 The Old Testament

□𐤓𐤕 is a comprehensive term covering such ideas as .
(a) completion, (b) soundness of body (Is. 57:19), (c) spiritual wholeness (Jer. 29:11)⁴² and (d) greetings (Gen. 29:6).

The stative verb □𐤓𐤕 means to be complete, to be sound, uninjured (Job 9:4). It is used of Nehemiah completing the walls (Neh. 6:15). □𐤓𐤕 can also mean (e) restoration (cf. the Piel in Lev. 5:24, Ex. 21:37, Joel 2:25). The notion of completeness is found in similar Aramaic and Assyrian words, but the verb itself does not appear to be used so frequently in the sense of safety and security as in the corresponding Arabic and Ethiopic.⁴³

More significant for our study is (f) its social dimension⁴⁴ portraying good relations between nations and men (1 K. 5:26) and (g) its eschatological fulfilment in the coming of the Messiah (Is. 2:2-4), affecting even the animal kingdom (Is. 11:6-8). Ezekiel shows its eschatological nature by refusing to offer any peace before the fall of Jerusalem in 587 B.C. (13:10 and 34:25, cf. Jer. 6:14 and 16:5).

- (h) It has a religious meaning denoting everything given by God in all areas of life.⁴⁵
- (i) It can denote inward peace (Is. 48:18 and 66:12).⁴⁶

It will be noticed that for Eph. 2:14 (c), (e), (f), (g) and (h) are particularly relevant.

In addition to the general concept of peace, which our writer would derive from his knowledge of the Old Testament, particular passages and incidents would influence his thinking.

4.2.3.5.1 Genesis 3 and 4

Since Eph. 5:31 cites Genesis 2:24, we are justified in suggesting that Gen. 3:15 has possible links because of the reference to enmity. The promise of the seed of the woman would be understood messianically. We notice in 4.4.3.4 how the rabbis saw a connection with Eccl. 10:8 which refers to a man being bitten by a serpent as he attempts to break through a wall. The wall was related to the barrier of Gen. 3:24.

Gen. 3 is associated with the loss of paradise and in Is. 11:1-9 the messianic restoration is like the Garden of Eden.⁴⁷ The story of Cain and Abel in Genesis 4 shows how this hatred is revealed between men, following the rebellion of man against God.

4.2.3.5.2 Melchizedek

The first priest mentioned in the Old Testament (Gen. 14) naturally gives rise to much speculation. He is referred to in the Psalms, Hebrews and Qumran. Ps. 110 claims for the Davidic King and Jerusalem the traditions of this priest-king. Since he is King of Salem (= peace) and having the name King of Righteousness he can be linked with the qualities of righteousness and peace (Heb. 7:2). These terms are linked in Is. 11. The theme of vv. 1-9 is peace and 11:5 mentions righteousness. This relationship of righteousness and peace is part of an ideology in the ancient Near East.⁴⁸

In/

In 1956, thirteen fragments of a scroll in which Melchizedek figured prominently were discovered by Bedouin shepherds in what is now known as Qumran Cave 11. Hence the text is called 11 QMelch. Its publication was "a new turning in Melchizedek research".⁴⁹ Written perhaps not long before Ephesians,⁵⁰ it depicts him as an eschatological angel or archangel who in the day of salvation announces release for the elect and executes judgement on Belial, etc.⁵¹

Ephesians gives no evidence of knowing the Melchizedek tradition but the writer would most likely know it from the Old Testament. As in Paul's recognised epistles, Christ is never ascribed as king. Hebrews says Melchizedek is the King of Peace. Ephesians says that Christ is peace.

4.2.3.5.3 Other possible Old Testament antecedents.

(a) The High Priestly blessing.

This asks God to bestow his peace (Numbers 6:26, cf. Ps. 85:8). It would be well-known to any Jewish writer, but again there is no evidence it is in mind.

(b) The holy war.

The writer would believe that his God was the God of the Old Testament and that he was therefore a God of war.⁵² The God who wars against principalities and authorities fought on the side of Israel in the fulfilment of his plans, in the days before the mystery of the Gentiles being fellow-heirs was revealed. But now that hostility is at an end, for Jews and Gentiles have become one. If Ephesians has this in mind (cf. ch. 6) it is clearly by way of contrast. Instead of destroying the nations, he gets rid of the hostility between them and makes them one. Ephesians may use the concept in the idea of fighting against the powers, but it is not in keeping with his argument to say that God erects a wall and then leads sorties over it.

(c) Gideon's altar.

When the angel of Yahweh appeared to Gideon and Gideon did not die, he erected an altar and called it "Yahweh is peace" (Jdg. 6:24).

(d)/

(d) Solomon.

His name means peace. In contrast to David, he is the man of peace who builds the temple (1 K. 5:3). Christ is greater than Solomon and builds the new temple. But Ephesians 2:21 when referring to the temple appears to have Zech. 6:12-15 in mind rather than Solomon. Paul nowhere refers to Solomon, although he refers to David and Elijah, the great figures on either side of him in Israelite history.⁵³

(e) Other possibilities.

Ezekiel 13:10ff mentions a false proclamation of peace, linked with a whitewashed wall that is to be broken down. This refers to the deceptive visions and lies of false prophets who announce peace.

Ephesians would know of the peaceful ruler of Micah 4 and 5. 5:5 says "this shall be the peace" and in 4:2 many nations come to the house of the God of Jacob. Ephesians' knowledge of Zech. 6:11-15 suggests he might know of 1:8-17 where four horsemen announce that the earth is now at peace, the temple will be rebuilt and Yahweh will soon return in triumph to Jerusalem. 9:9 speaks of the lowly Messiah who rides peaceably on an ass, yet whose dominion is from sea to sea.⁵⁴

4.2.3.5.4 ¹ Isaiah

This would appear to be the book Ephesians has in mind most of all, since it is quoted in 2:13 and 17. In the same chapter (57:21) Isaiah says there is no peace for the wicked. Is. 59 speaks of those separated from God who have not known the way of peace. Is. 52:7 speaks of the one who preached peace (cf. Eph. 2:17). Is. 53:5 has *יְדִיבֵשׁ* (LXX *εἰρήνης ἡμῶν*) when referring to the chastisement with which our peace is won. We are made whole by his punishment.⁵⁵ Is. 54:10 shows that whatever happens his covenant of peace shall not be removed.

But we can look further than Deutero-Isaiah for to the writer there would be no idea of division. Isaiah would be a unity, so passages in the earlier part of the book would automatically come to mind. There are many passages on the messianic era of peace, 2:1-4, 11:1-9, 35:5-10, 55:12-13 and 66:12. But it is ch. 9:6, 7 that/

that is most conspicuous, since it speaks of a child to be born, one of whose titles would be Prince of Peace.

We are concerned here not so much with what Isaiah meant but how it would be understood in New Testament times and by our author. The concept of the Messiah, seen at first as the Davidic king (e.g. Solomon), was projected into the future, when the Judaeen king failed to live up to expectation. Such a king was the apostate Ahaz, who stimulates Isaiah's predictions in chapters 7 and 9. Is. 9:6, 7 clearly predicts a future Davidic king, but Isaiah may not have equated him with the child of Is. 7. The Prophet might have seen in the young woman and her son the righteous remnant of the mother Israel.⁵⁶ But by the time of Ephesians the various passages would be seen as referring to one figure. The hope, which for a while was transferred to the Hasmonean house, returned to David's house in the Psalms of Solomon (first century B.C.) where Messiah is now a proper name (17:32-43).

While there are hints of other eschatological figures in the Intertestamental Literature (Test Levi 18 (a new priest) and Test Judah 24 (a star from Jacob)) the Qumran literature (CD 7:20, 1QM6, 1QS b 5:20) and the New Testament (Mt. 16:14), most hope is centred in the Davidic Messiah. He is the Immanuel of Is. 7 (Mt. 1:23) and the Prince of Peace of Isaiah 9 (Mt. 4:15-16 cites Is. 9:1-2). He does not just make war to cease, but removes the cause of war. He is the embodiment of peace. Is. 9:6, 7 may not refer to his birth, but be a reference to his accession, when on the day of his enthronement he was hailed as the adopted son, begotten of Yahweh. This is possible as J. Bright suggests⁵⁷ but we have no specific evidence for an enthronement festival in Israel like that of Babylon, apart from the Royal Psalms (e.g. 2, 21, 72, 89, 110 and 132).

He is called a son (cf. Ps. 2:7b) "one counselling wonderful things", the mighty God.⁵⁸ Some Jewish interpreters distribute the names among God and the child. "God who is marvellous in counsel, mighty God, everlasting Father, gave him the name Prince of Peace."⁵⁹ But God is not described in such a lengthy manner elsewhere in the Old Testament.

This/

This passage is clearly one that is likely to be in the writer's mind. This possibility is strengthened by the fact that the Rabbis were fond of the passage, e.g. R. Jehoschua (cir. A.D.90) said "Great is the peace, for the name of God is called peace", and R. Jose the Galilean (cir. A.D.110) said "also the name of the Messiah is called peace, because it says, everlasting Father, Prince of Peace etc". He also quotes Is. 52:7 in connection with the peace when the Messiah is revealed.⁶⁰

Thus to writer and readers the term peace would make many Old Testament passages come to mind.⁶¹

4.2.3.6 The Jewish background apart from the Old Testament.

4.2.3.6.1 The Rabbinic Writings.

Our literary evidence is late, but since tradition was strong, preserved and revered, its basis is likely to antedate Ephesians.⁶² Peace is still used for greeting people, but it has become in other uses a more negative word than in the Old Testament. It is the opposite of strife between individuals (S Num 42 on 6:26, M. Peah 1:1) and between nations. Discord would hinder the coming of the Messiah (M. Eduyoth 8:7). Elijah must first establish peace in the world, and the very continuation of the world depends on peace (M. Aboth 1:18).⁶³ Peace would come through Israel being instructed correctly, e.g. b. Kerithoth 28b, "R. Eleazar said in the name of Hanina, the disciples of the sages increase peace throughout the world, as it is said, and all thy children shall be taught of the Lord and great shall be the peace of thy children".⁶⁴ Making peace was something to hold on to (b. Yebamoth 109a).

In Ephesians, "Peace" is more than an abstract thought, since it is personified. The Rabbis saw it as an entity, as b. Berakhoth 64a shows. R. Abin the Levite said "when a man takes leave of his fellow, he should not say to him "go in peace" but "go to peace". For Moses, to whom Jethro said "go to peace" went up and prospered, whereas Absalom, to whom David said "go in peace", went away and was hung". In b. Kethuboth (i.e. laws relating to married life) 104a, R. Eleazar stated "when a righteous/

righteous man departs from the world he is welcomed by three companies of ministering angels. One exclaims "come into peace" another says "he who walketh in his uprightness" and the third "he shall enter into peace". In the Mishnah Uktzin, R. Simeon b Halaftha said "the holy one, blessed is he, found no vessel that could contain blessing for Israel, save that of peace" (citing Ps. 29:11).

9 A person is described as peace in Talmud Berakhoth 39b. There is discussion whether one should say the blessing first and afterwards break the loaf or put the broken piece under the whole loaf and say the blessing. A Tanna recited in the presence of R. Nahman b Isaac, "One should place the broken piece under the whole loaf and then break and say the benediction." He said, "What is your name?" "Shalman" he replied. He said to him, "Thou art peace and thy Mishnah is faultless (Shelemah) for thou hast made peace between the scholars." As in Eph. 2:14 one who is a peacemaker and who brings peace is called peace.

These quotations, however, show how different and exclusive in contrast was the Jewish peace to that of the writer of Ephesians. In Section 8.3.1 we notice the similarities and differences between Ephesians and the Rabbinic writings in the exegesis of scripture.

4.2.3.6.2 Apocalyptic Writings.

There is much debate concerning the relationship of apocalyptic and rabbinic thought to each other.⁶⁵ Margaret Barker has claimed that there is no direct line discernible between apocalyptic writings and rabbinic style Judaism.⁶⁶ There is no proof of any references to Apocalyptic literature in the Rabbinic writings of the first six centuries of the Christian era. But history shows that the Jewish nation as a whole did have Apocalyptic tendencies, which are revealed in the attitude during the A.D. 66-73 war with Rome and in the rebellion of Bar Cochba. Nevertheless A.D. 70 marked the decline of Apocalyptic and the triumph of Pharisaism which set Judaism on the course it still follows.

Apocalyptic expects much war before peace finally comes. Some of the Pseudepigraphic books like the Apocrypha (Tobit 14:5ff) see an earthly kingdom of peace coming in the present era (1 Enoch 1-36, Sib Orac 3:741ff). The Psalms of Solomon 17:22-25 have the Messiah seizing power and destroying the heathen and sinner. Other works see a new heaven and earth beyond this present order (1 En. 45-46). Others compromise with an interim earthly kingdom as well (2 Esdras 7:28).

Ephesians is not clearly influenced by or at least is not interested in this kind of thought. Time is not so important now that Christ has triumphed and Christians are in the heavenlies. It sees fulfilment in Christ, already exalted with Jew and Gentile incorporated together because of him. A close parallel is 1 Enoch 58:4 "there shall be peace to the righteous in the name of the eternal Lord". (cf. 1 En. 1:7f.) The angel of peace who is a mediator between God and man is found in 1 Enoch, e.g. 52:5 and The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs know the angel of intercession (e.g. Test. Dan. 6:2).

4.2.3.6.3 Qumran

The closest similarities between Qumran literature and the New Testament are found in John, Ephesians and Colossians.⁶⁷ The parallels, especially to Eph. 5:3-17, led K.G. Kuhn to abandon Bultmann's gnostic interpretation of Ephesians.⁶⁸

But the general outlook is different. The Qumran sectaries expected a Holy War with Yahweh's intervention bringing peace, after the wicked (including the Jewish leaders) had been destroyed.⁶⁹ Qumran with a war between light and darkness on the earthly scale is the antithesis of Ephesians. In Ephesians it is spiritual warfare of heaven and earth versus the powers.⁷⁰ In Qumran you join the community by separation. In Ephesians you form a new community with your former enemies.

Qumran and Ephesians both share such concepts as light and darkness, predestination, the people of God, warfare and, most strikingly of all, the sectaries believe that they have already entered into the enjoyment of peace (IQS 8:4-9, CD 1:4). Peace is eternal (IQS 2:4) abundant (IQS 4:7) without end (IQH 7:15, 15:16) and without limit (IQH 18:30).

Paradoxically the community (cf. Eph. 6:10ff) is still in the midst of the conflict (CD 4:13). The members are sons of light opposed to the children of darkness (IQM 1:9ff). They cannot however really enjoy the fruits of peace because of their pessimistic view, which is such a contrast to the optimism of Ephesians. The coming of peace really awaits God's intervention (IQH 1:17) and is only confirmed after its recipients have been tried in the fire. There was to be nothing but love towards other sons of light (CD 8) which is a much smaller idea of who was one's neighbour than the view of Ephesians.

4.2.3.7 The wider background.

We have already noticed the personification of peace in Greek thought. Philo is in Greek fashion when he uses the word negatively in contrast to war (De Vita Mos 1:304) and subjectively (De Somnis 2:253) (De Ebrietate 97). Philo commends Phinehas for his zeal, for which God gave him as a reward the gifts of peace and priesthood (De Spec Leg 1:56, 7). Philo distinguishes war between peoples from war in nature (De Spec Leg 2:188-192).

In Plato the usual meaning of εἰρήνη is peaceful conduct,⁷¹ although peaceableness towards others is generally rendered either by φιλία or ἀρμονία. Εἰρήνη is not used in a spiritual sense prior to the Stoics,⁷² who however prefer γαλήνη perhaps because peace was used of the military situation in the empire.⁷³ They held like Ephesians that all men were equal by divine right.

In the first century A.D., the Roman world enjoyed the "Pax Romana". Apart from Palestine and the German and Parthian frontiers, peace and stability were known. There was the famous prediction of the golden age in Vergil's fourth Eclogue.⁷⁴ But this has the Hellenistic idea of the Cosmocrator, which is different from Ephesians. The Hellenistic world only knows God as the divine, the power and principle of the cosmos. Peace is not through reconciliation.

This peace of Augustus, who closed the doors of the temple of Janus after many years, is also mentioned by Epictetus, who says that "Caesar seems to provide us with profound peace, there are no wars any/

any longer nor battles."⁷⁵ Suetonius cites Augustus "May it be granted to me to establish the commonwealth on its foundations so safely and soundly and to receive the reward for that action that I seek, that I may be called the author of the best state of things and when I die may carry with me the hope that the foundation of the commonwealth that I have laid will remain unshaken".⁷⁶ Figures representing peace, valour and fortune were imprinted on coins and "the longing for a Saviour who would bring peace to earth led to the belief that Augustus was an incarnation of deity".⁷⁷ The Christian Apologist Melito argued that Augustus's establishment of peace was a providential part of the divine preparation for the Gospel.⁷⁸

The Romans tried hard to preserve peace throughout the Near East between Jew and Greek, but in Judaea they failed. Felix was not so successful as Tertullus claimed (Acts 24:2). Only Christ "our peace" could achieve this true peace.

Nero in spite of his bad reputation had some achievement. The first five years of his reign (54-59) were successful and even two years before his death it was still partly true that this was a peaceful reign. In 66 as a result of his agreement with Tiridates, he closed the doors of the Temple of Janus for a second time, in order to reiterate that peace had truly come. A column was erected at Mainz at the same time to commemorate Tiridates' arrival in Rome to celebrate the coming of peace.⁷⁹ It is conceivable that Paul could have been in Rome in 66. Nero's persecution of Christians was in 64, but relatively early versions of the death of Peter and Paul do not associate their deaths with this. Paul probably suffered earlier, unless he was released and put to death on a later visit to Rome.⁸⁰ If so, what more appropriate time than the celebrations for Tiridates to get rid of a troublemaker who disturbed the peace?

Nero was a conqueror who brought peace but Paul says "we are more than conquerors" (Romans 8:37) and "Christ is our peace". The writer of Ephesians would have agreed with the later sentiment of Tacitus that "the noblest end to wars was when matters were settled by pardoning the conquered".⁸¹

4.2.4 Summary

These parallels show how relevant and fitting it was to call Christ the peace and what a full background it would have in the mind of the writer. But the only clear indications of dependence are upon the Old Testament, particularly Isaiah.

Ephesians 2 takes this thought of peace further than most of the New Testament. The basis is peace with God. It is peace between those reconciled with God and it is a stage towards the reconciliation of all things in Christ (Col. 1:20). The subsequent clauses will tell us what Christ has done to achieve this and to deserve this title.

4.3 ὁ ποιήσας τὰ ἀμφότερα ἐν

The clause appears to be equivalent to a relative one "who has made both one". This is the first of the parallel participial clauses "who made both one", "destroyed the middle wall" and "annulling the law of commandments in decrees". The word "enmity" and "in his flesh" can be connected grammatically with either of the last two clauses, separately or together.

This first clause is descriptive of the peace or of the person who is the peace, since the participle ὁ ποιήσας is either in apposition to αὐτός or εἰρήνη.⁸² We are told the first of many things which Christ has achieved to deserve the title peace. A separation between Christians is unthinkable. They become a dwelling of God, a heavenly city (Eph. 2:19-22).

4.3.1 Why do we have neuter words?

The neuter is surprising because the context refers to people, Gentile and Jew, the uncircumcised and circumcised of v.11, the far and near of v.13 and the "our" of this verse.

Τοὺς δύο (v.15) is masculine. Why does the author then use the neuter here, or does he not when writing v.14 think as far ahead as v.15? We have a grammatical change, which may indicate a theological change.

We can understand the neuter $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ to represent a meaning like organism,⁸³ entity or a neuter word like $\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta$ ⁸⁴ or $\pi\lambda\acute{\eta}\rho\eta\mu\alpha$. A parallel to the latter is found in the Valentinian saying "since we were divided Jesus was baptized that the undivided might be divided, until he united us with them in the Pleroma, in order that we, the many become one, may all of us be united with the One, which for our sakes was divided".⁸⁵

$\acute{\alpha}\rho\phi\acute{o}\tau\epsilon\rho\alpha$ although neuter is not a problem in itself. But the word is masculine in vv. 16 and 18 and the masculine gender is used from $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\alpha$ onwards because of $\acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\nu$.⁸⁶ The real problem is not why the author changed from neuter to masculine, but why he began with neuter at all. Did he not foresee where he was going? In different works or even sections of the same work, this would be understandable, e.g. when Rom. 11:32 and Gal. 3:22 cite the same scripture the former has $\tau\acute{o}\upsilon\varsigma\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha\varsigma$ and the latter $\tau\acute{\alpha}\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha$. But would such a change occur a few verses apart and the word still have the same meaning? 1 Cor. 1:26ff has $\tau\acute{\alpha}\ \acute{\alpha}\sigma\theta\epsilon\kappa\eta$ opposed to $\omicron\acute{\iota}\ \sigma\omicron\phi\omicron\iota$ but these are not different genders of the same word.

The neuter is one reason why under Schlier's inspiration,⁸⁷ Schille, Gnllka and others found a cosmic hymn which had in mind the two spheres heavenly and earthly ($\tau\acute{\alpha}\ \acute{\epsilon}\pi\omicron\upsilon\rho\acute{\alpha}\nu\iota\alpha$, $\tau\acute{\alpha}\ \acute{\upsilon}\pi\epsilon\rho\omicron\upsilon\rho\acute{\alpha}\nu\iota\alpha$)⁸⁸ separated by the cosmic barrier ($\mu\epsilon\sigma\acute{o}\tau\omicron\iota\chi\omicron\nu$). The various hymn suggestions that have been made all contain this phrase "who made both one" as a core section.

Schlier accepts that a neuter word can represent persons, e.g. John 3:6, 1 Cor. 1:27, when they are referred to in a general way, but here the reference is too explicit for this. He supports his suggestion of a gnostic background with other parallels in the chapter and epistle. In his previous Christus und die Kirche im Epheserbrief he has chapters on the ascent of the Redeemer, the heavenly wall, the church as a body, the body as a building and the heavenly marriage. All can have a gnostic background.

Gnllka agrees that the author uses a hymn, which explains why we have the neuter $\acute{\alpha}\rho\phi\acute{o}\tau\epsilon\rho\alpha$. The author changes the underlying sense of two spheres to make it refer to persons.⁸⁹ Gnllka also believes it can refer to spheres without being gnostic. Dualism is/

is not only found in Gnosticism. In Greek philosophy there is always the search for unity.⁹⁰

But if it were a hymn the author was using, to which he made many additions, why did he not alter the neuter to masculine? Presumably, because he knew the word would be understood quite easily of persons. The neuter for persons is not so rare in the New Testament. It is grammatically acceptable⁹¹ and there are several New Testament examples,⁹² e.g. Gal. 3:22 τὰ πάντα. It may simply be an instance of the neuter being used to describe persons in a general⁹³ way. In Col. 1:16 τὰ πάντα is again found, perhaps referring to persons, although it probably refers to things as well. The neuter ἓν is perfectly understandable. People are so called in Gal. 3:28 (G 33 lat) and 1 Cor. 3:8. In John 10:30 the Father and Son are thus described.

Ἀμφότερα is more difficult, but we can compare 1 Cor. 1:27, 28 which have several neuter words (cf. Heb. 7:7).⁹⁴ In 2 Cor. 5:17 κτίσις is feminine, but is immediately followed by the neuter ἀρχαῖα and καινὰ. In John 10:16 people are described in the feminine as ποίμνη.⁹⁵

The author, however, saw no problem with the neuter and there is no textual evidence that it was a problem to editors of the text. We must therefore take the text as it stands and see if it can have any special significance, before insisting it must be a remnant of an earlier usage.

The neuter could be used to express abstract qualities like duality and unity⁹⁶ and to stress two organisations, two systems, whereas later in 2:16 the writer refers to the two groups of individuals.⁹⁷ If this were the case, we would have expected people to be mentioned first and then the systems, since in this passage individualities cease to be important as the thought proceeds. Instead of people hating one another, there is one new man, one new body. The author may have had a particular word in mind such as μέρη or δένδρον.⁹⁸ ἔθνη is found in v.11 and in 3:6.⁹⁹ But would the writer have classed the Jews as an ἔθνος like Gentile nations and not as λαός? 1 Peter 2:9 does so, but qualifies with the word holy. Σῶμα is a more likely word, since it occurs in v.16.

Some words are unsuitable, because they do not fit both words $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ and $\acute{\alpha}\rho\phi\acute{o}\tau\epsilon\rho\alpha$ e.g. $\pi\lambda\eta\rho\acute{\omega}\rho\alpha$ and $\mu\upsilon\sigma\tau\acute{\eta}\rho\iota\omicron\nu$ are only appropriate for $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$; ¹⁰⁰ $\mu\upsilon\sigma\tau\acute{\eta}\rho\iota\omicron\nu$ is also unlikely because the mystery is that they have become one, not that they have become one mystery.

The author may have had no other words in mind at all and was thinking of what they have become ($\acute{\epsilon}\nu$, cf. Gal. 3:28) and then wrote $\acute{\alpha}\rho\phi\acute{o}\tau\epsilon\rho\alpha$ to agree with it in gender. He may have changed to masculine later in the same way as he changes from "new man" to "body". In 2:8 he changes from the feminine $\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$ to neuter $\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron$. It may be a variation of language. It may be to show it is a different conglomeration. Christians are a new entity, neither masculine nor feminine, a third race, not on the same level as the previous two.¹⁰¹ The Jews divided the world into two types, but the Christian is a new type, since Jew and Gentile departed from God on diverse roads.¹⁰² God now brings them back together and to him. They are not changed as regards race, not amalgamated ethnically, but are brought to a higher position of privilege in relation to God. Chrysostom says vividly that "he has raised both us and them to a yet higher position, like silver and lead melted down and become gold, like a slave and adopted son, both of whom have offended him, yet are made heirs."¹⁰³ But Chrysostom is not quite exact. The old entities in some sense do remain. The writer can still speak of you and us.

4.3.2 What the passage says.

- a) The aorist $\pi\alpha\iota\eta\sigma\alpha\varsigma$ shows that the act of incorporation took place at one specific time, by a specific act, which was an act of Jesus. There was only one event which placed believers in the heavenlies, although people still join one by one and the enmity remains among those outside of Christ.
- b) The two groups have not simply been brought side by side, but have been made one. Elsewhere the writer speaks of this as a mystery previously hidden but now revealed.¹⁰⁴
- c) It shows there was before Christ a distinction between races. The writer believes God allowed this at least on a temporary basis (2:12). It is not a case of men coming to realise there never was a distinction. There was, but it is no longer relevant.

4.3.3 Parallels to this thought.

Many of these parallels are probably dependent upon Ephesians, e.g. 2 Clement 12:2. The Lord himself when asked by someone when his kingdom shall come said, "when the two shall be one and the inside as the outside and the male with the female, neither male nor female."

Not so clearly linked with Ephesians but still reflecting New Testament language is the gnostic Gospel of Philip. "In the days when we were Hebrews, we were orphans we had (only) our mother, but when we became Christians, we acquired Father and mother (6), Christ came, he ransomed the strangers, he made them his own and he separated his own, whom he had deposited as pledges according to his will (9). The Children of the heavenlies are more numerous than (those) of the earthly man (28). If you say, I am a Jew, nobody will be moved, if you say I am a Roman, nobody will be upset. If you say, I am a Greek, a barbarian, a slave (a freeman) nobody will be disturbed, if you say I am a Christian, the whole world will shake (49). Therefore Christ came that he might set right again the separation which arose from the beginning and unite the two and give life to those who died in the separation and unite them". (78)

Valentinians, whose teaching Philip shares in many respects, would consider the Jewish-Gentile question a dated issue and would interpret Eph. 2:14-17 allegorically as two groups of psychics and spirituals.

The Naassene Preaching has ἀμφότερα (Hipp. Ref. 5:7). The self-originate Adames is bisexual (5:6, 3ff) but has three parts, intellectual, psychic and earthly, which are all found in one man Jesus. Attis is spoken of as being cut off from the earthly parts of the creation (here) below and "has gone over to the eternal substance, where there is neither female nor male, but a new creature, a new man who is bisexual" (5:7, 15). An acquaintance with the New Testament seems obvious but the language could receive some of this colouring from Hippolytus himself.

The Hermetic Corpus (CH 4:6) refers to mortal and divine things as both (ἀμφότερα) and two (δύο τῶν ὄντων).

The Odes of Solomon have the eschatological battle, where the goal of the deed of Christ is the uniting of heaven and earth, 8:7, 9:6, 11:3 (cf. Eph. 1:10 and Col. 1:20).

The author of Ephesians is dependent on none of these. It is the fact of Jew and Gentile together that motivates the writer. Such a wonder does not need and has for him no exact parallels. Unprecedented, it is without clear antecedent for illustration.

4.3.4 Antecedents to the thought.

The Old Testament expected the nations to come to worship the God of Israel and in Romans 15:9-12, three texts are brought together from three different parts of the Old Testament. However the bringing of the nations together did not come in quite the way the Old Testament envisaged. "That Gentiles should have the Messiah of Israel, now the exalted Lord, dwelling in their hearts by faith as the living hope of coming glory - this was something completely untemplated before."¹⁰⁵

Israel expected "two" to become "one", not only by the return of the dispersion, but through the lost tribes of Israel being restored and united with Judah. Ezekiel 37:19 portrays Israel and Judah as one stick. The prophets regarded the restoration of the two kingdoms as one of the integral elements of the messianic restoration.¹⁰⁶ Ephesians takes these two thoughts further (perhaps consciously) and sees the fundamental distinction of Jew and Gentile as being overcome.

In Zech. 8:20-23 the nations come to Jerusalem to seek the favour of Yahweh.¹⁰⁷ Cyrus knows it is the God of Israel, who calls him by name for the sake of Israel ... "that men may know from the rising of the sun and from the west that there is none beside me" (Is. 45:3-6).

A longer universalistic section appears in Is. 19:18-24, where both Egypt and Assyria, the traditional enemies of Judah, become worshippers of Yahweh. These nations even receive the designations which originally belonged exclusively to Israel as the people of Yahweh.¹⁰⁸ In Apocalyptic literature, God is seen as controlling/

controlling history and working according to plan in different ages (cf. II Enoch 32:2-33; 2). But there is chaos and disarray before the final fulfilment. We do not find this in Ephesians. It might be said to have "realised apocalyptic".¹⁰⁹ The Book of Daniel is therefore hardly "as close to Ephesians" as is sometimes suggested.¹¹⁰

Philo saw that oneness would result from the Jewish laws influencing other nations and he used Greek thought to spread this ideal. "The laws of the Jewish people attract and win the attention of all, of barbarians, of Greeks, of dwellers on the mainland and islands, of nations, of the east and west, of Europe and Asia, of the whole inhabited world from end to end."¹¹¹ "Everywhere a process was afoot of syncretizing the old religions with new ones streaming in, especially from the East."¹¹²

Matthew has the features of a Jewish Gospel (5:18) but sees the Gentiles as included (2:1-12, 28:19).¹¹³ The Acts suggests that by the time it was written the gospel had long since finally broken down the once hard contested and stubbornly defended boundaries between the privileged people of the Jews and the Gentiles.

4.3.4.1 Paul

In Romans, the Jews and Gentiles are one in Christ, although the Jews are clearly the parent stock into which others are grafted.¹¹⁴ Paul is however speaking of a predominantly Gentile church into which Jews hopefully can be regrafted to make Gentile and Jew one in Christ. Ephesians is written to show what God has done for Gentiles; Jewish unbelief is not mentioned. Romans 9-11 on the other hand shows instead what God is yet going to do for the Jews.

Paul's Jewish background meant he habitually divided humanity into Jew and Gentile.¹¹⁵ Many believe that Paul's doctrine of justification developed from his defending the right of Gentile converts.¹¹⁶

The/

The closest passage in Paul to Eph. 2:14-17 is Rom. 15:8, 9, "Christ became a servant to the circumcised to confirm the promises given to the patriarchs, that the Gentiles might glorify God for his mercy". Paul cites the Old Testament to show that Gentiles are to rejoice with Jews, although Deut. 32:43 (Rom. 15:10) is speaking of victorious Israel, as does Is. 11:10 (Rom. 15:12). Is. 11:10 speaks of nations seeking him (11:11 = the remnant) but Ps. 117:1 (Rom. 15:11) is more general, saying "praise the Lord all Gentiles".

Romans shows the union of Jew and Gentile in Christ, but does not stress a previous barrier between them.

4.4 The Middle Wall of Partition.

4.4.1 Καί

This can be a simple conjunction, showing that the clause it introduces is parallel to the previous one about the two becoming one. Both these clauses have aorist participles.

It could be epexegetic or explicative, meaning "inasmuch as"¹¹⁷ or "with a view to",¹¹⁸ thus making the clause subsequent to the other one. This is unlikely. The aorist participles refer to one and the same event. Both are dependent on "he is our peace". Jew and Gentile cannot be one unless the dividing fence is removed.

4.4.2 Τὸ μεσότοιχον τοῦ φραγμοῦ

We have two words which seem to say the same thing. They are linked by a genitive (see 4.4.2.5). Such apparent repetition is found in "law of commandments", "strangers and sojourners", etc. The two words together are probably an example of what is known as Apollonius' Canon that "nouns in regimen must have articles prefixed to both of them or neither". Ephesians normally observes this rule.¹¹⁹

Μεσότοιχον

A Hapax Legomenon such as this is harder to explain if it is regarded as being from the author of the epistle (whose vocabulary we know a little) than it would be if he were quoting a hymn. It is/

is even more unusual if the epistle is by Paul whose vocabulary we know so much more. A technical or distinct metaphor seems to be in mind.

It is only the compound word which is rare in Biblical and secular Greek literature. The two parts as separate words are very common.¹²⁰ The fact that he links with the similar word *φραγροῦ* may be his love for saying a thing in two or three different ways and for using words in tandem which are more or less synonymous (1:4, 9, 19; 2:15, 19). Compound words are also a feature of Ephesians, *αἰχμαλωτεύειν, ἀνθρῳπῳρῆσκος, κλυδωνίζοντες, κοσμοκράτης, ὀφθαλμοδουλεία, μυρολογία πολυποίκιλος*

They are also a feature of Colossians, *αἰσχρολογία, ἐβελοθησκεία πιθανολογία, Χειρόγραφον*

Possible clues to the meaning of *μεσότοιχον* are (a) the apparent synonym *φραγροῦ* (b) the context, which shows it is something to do with the separation of the Jews and Gentiles, with the law, or with illustrating the law and its statutes and ordinances, with the hostility between Jews and Gentiles and between men and God. According to the context, separation is the primary thought, although this would lead to the thought of protection.¹²¹ Jews would regard themselves as protected from the unclean Gentiles. The latter would see the separation as that which isolated the Jews from the rest of mankind.

4.4.2.1 Greek parallels.

The compound word has not been found in biblical Greek. References in the Church Fathers as well as in secular Greek are rare.¹²² It means a party wall or partition wall, e.g. in a house.

Athenaeus cites Eratosthenes of Cyrene (c. 275-194 B.C.) who used it figuratively, having the masculine with the article in reference to Aristo the Stoic, *ἥδη δὲ ποτὲ καὶ τοῦτον πεφώρακα τὸν τῆς ἡδονῆς καὶ ἀρετῆς μεσότοιχον διορύττοντα καὶ ἀναφαινόμενον παρὰ τῇ ἡδονῇ*.¹²³

The masculine noun is also in an inscription from Argos recorded in the Bulletin de Correspondance Hellenique and either the masculine or neuter is in an inscription from Didyma, ἐπὶ τοῦ μεσότοιχου.¹²⁴ Abbott finds a reference in Hesychius (Fifth Century A.D.).

The adjective μεσότοιχων in the Amherst Papyri could be from μεσότοιχον (according to MM) ὁμολογῶν πεπραμένῳ σοι οἰκίαν καὶ τὴν ἐνούσαν αὐλὴν καὶ ἡμισυ μέρος τῶν μεσότοιχον(μεσότυχων) οἰκων.¹²⁵ This is from a fragmentary list of abstracts of contracts regarding sales of house property at Hermopolis.¹²⁶

The two parts of the word, as adjective and noun ὁ μέσος τοῖχος, are found for a party wall between two houses. Josephus uses the words for the inner wall of the temple (Ant. 8:71). It is just possible that the writer of Ephesians, if post-Pauline, had read Josephus.¹²⁷

4.4.2.2 Μέσος

Since μέσος qualifies the word for wall, we must survey other Greek words which are qualified with μέσος and see how they are modified by it. It means "middle", e.g. of the night, the veil, the throne, a group. Rev. 8:13 uses it of the mid-heaven. Ἐκ τοῦ μέσου means out of the way, out of sight (cf. the verb μεσῶν). Μεσοβασιλεία means what divides two reigns, μέσος can signify what is between, e.g. Mesopotamia, two knots (μεσογονάτιον) two fingers (μεσοδάκτυλον). This shows that division is likely to be meant, as the context suggests. But it is not absolutely certain since μεσόδεγμα means bond, tie.

Similar to Ephesians 2:14 is μεσοκρινής - a parting in the middle. It could even be a space between walls on the analogy of μεσοπύργιον or a space between towers¹²⁸ (cf. μεσοτύλιον).

4.4.2.3 Τοῖχος

The word for wall is a common word. Its significance usually depends on the purpose for which the wall was built, either to separate (ἡ'ρ : τοῖχος Ez. 43:8) or to enclose (2 K. 4:10 with ὑπερώων) or to protect (Lev. 25:29 ἡ'π : τετειχισμένος). The/

The word is normally used of walls in a house or the sides of a ship and the similar word τεῖχος is used of a city wall (Deut. 28:52). It has to be breached (2 K. 14:13 = 2 Chr. 25:23) or torn down (Ez. 26:12, Jer. 50:15). It is used metaphorically in Jer. 4:19f (7'p) and in Amos 7:7 where it refers to Israel.

4.4.2.4 Φραγμός

The verb φράσσω means to fence around¹²⁹ and the noun's basic meaning is fence,¹³⁰ conveying the idea of enclosure, which implies either protection or separation.¹³¹

Interpreters of Eph. 2:14, both ancient and modern, naturally refer to Isaiah's parable of the vineyard. The law (which separated Israel and was intended for their protection) became a hedge (7'p) separating them from God. The LXX background of φραγμός may have an emphasis of protection, but clearly the emphasis in Ephesians is on separation and in this particular context it strengthens the previous word. It is this second word that is used in the cosmic reference to separation between the heavenly and the lower worlds, which are often cited as parallels to Eph. 2:14, e.g. Ignatius to the Trallians 9:4 (long rec):

ἔσταυρώθη καὶ ἀπέθανεν...καὶ κατήλθεν εἰς ἁδὴν μόνος
ἀνῆλθεν δὲ μετὰ πλῆθους καὶ ἔσχισεν τὸν ἀπ' αἰῶνος φραγμὸν
καὶ τό μεσότοιχον αὐτοῦ ἔλυσε καὶ ἀνέστη διὰ τριῶν
ἡμερῶν ἐγείραντος αὐτοῦ τοῦ πατρὸς.

and the Acts of Thomas 32: ἐγὼ εἶμι ὁ διὰ τοῦ φραγμοῦ
εἰσελθὼν ἐν τῇ παραδείσῳ

and Acts of Philip 48:10ff: παραίτησαι τὰς μυτηρὰς καὶ
κακὰς θυσιάς τῶν εἰδώλων αἰτινές εἰσιν γεωργία τοῦ
ἐχθροῦ ὁ σκοτεινὸς φραγμός

Those who see gnostic or Jewish conceptions of the law behind Eph. 2:14 stress φραγμός. Those who see the Jewish Temple barrier stress the former word μεσότοιχον. Yet for both the rare word μεσότοιχον remains a problem.

4.4.2.5/

4.4.2.5 The Genitive.

This could indicate -

- (a) Quality, explaining that the barrier separates or protects,¹³²
- (b) Possession, i.e. belonging to the stockade,
- (c) Identity "consisting in",
- (d) The agent, the separation produced by the stockade,¹³³ or
- (e) Apposition "namely the fence".¹³⁴

The majority of exegetes prefer either the last suggestion or the third, an exegetical genitive (Schlier) which repeats with new words the same idea of the previous substantive "the middle wall consisting in a barrier or stockade".¹³⁵ Ephesians has a predilection to repeat in the genitive the same or similar ideas as that already contained in the governing substantive.¹³⁶ Masson points out that it is not the only embarrassing genitive in the epistle.¹³⁷ "The combination of the two Greek nouns yields a composite sense. It is a wall that prevents certain persons from entering a house or city (cf. 2:18) and is therefore a mark of hostility." ¹³⁸

4.4.3 A Metaphor.

We use the words wall and barrier as metaphors without necessarily having a particular wall in mind. Examples can be easily found or heard in conversation, e.g. J.D. Smart writing about the Old Testament says that we need "not a return to allegory and typology, but a faithful exegesis and exposition of scripture that will wrestle with the works of the ancient witnesses until the walls of the centuries become thin and they tell us in our day, what they knew so well in their own day".¹³⁹ E. Kasemann uses the word wall twice as a metaphor only thirteen pages apart.¹⁴⁰ The American poet Robert Frost has the metaphorical theme of wall in one of his most famous poems, Mending Walls.

Before I built a wall, I'd ask to know
What I was walling in or walling out.
And to whom I was like to give offense.
Something there is
that doesn't love a wall.
That wants it down.

The late President Sadat of Egypt in his historic first official visit to Jerusalem in November 1977 spoke on his arrival of the breaking down of the wall between Egypt and Israel.

We talk about a central barrier, the sound barrier, etc. It is true we often have a specific obstacle in mind such as the Berlin Wall, the Iron Curtain,¹⁴¹ but even so the metaphor existed previous to the illustration.

Walls used to be much more significant than they are now. We only need them in our homes for warmth, shelter and privacy.¹⁴² People of earlier days needed them around their cities for defence. Athens had its long walls to ensure a supply of food from its port Piraeus in time of war.

Τοῖχος is used as a metaphor in Acts 23:3 and proverbially by Pausanias (6:3, 15). We can compare "whited sepulchres" (Mt. 13:27). Ez. 13:10-16 has the metaphorical use of the wall, which the false prophets have whitewashed.

No one writes much without metaphors and they are quite frequent in Ephesians 2,¹⁴³ especially those relating to edifices, e.g. *θεμέλιος, ἀκρογωνιαίον, οἰκοδομή* even the temple is used metaphorically. *Προσαγωγή* may be another one and be the opposite of *μεσότοιχον*.

The wall is used as a metaphor in the Rabbinic writings. *b.Talmud Berak 63a* mentions a metaphorical use of fence. Abbahu relates how Hananiah when in the Dispersion among many with different customs, was visited by two Rabbis whom he denounced for opposing him. They replied "you have already built and you cannot overthrow, you have made a fence and you cannot break it down" (i.e. you cannot take away from us the name you have conferred on us). (cf *b.Berak 4b*), *b.Erubin 100b* shows how Rab found an open field and put up a fence around it. This is a metaphor about people being lax in their religious observance (morally exposed like an open field). Rab had additional restrictions imposed upon them in order to keep them from further transgressions.

In/

In b'Yebamoth (which deals with the subjects of marriage, divorce, women, etc.) 62b, the two words wall and peace are found together. It says that unmarried men are without a (protecting) wall. Rabba b'Ulla says they are also without peace.

Philo uses the word wall in a protective sense when he speaks of a road not being a trackless route (i.e. perverted character) but "a wall and a protection to those who are able to save themselves".¹⁴⁴

The writer of Ephesians may have had no particular illustration in mind, just as we use the words wall and barrier. The walls of his prison cell separated him from his fellow Christians. But he could have been thinking of one that the community knew or he thought or assumed they knew. He could have had one in mind which they did not know, a cliché which he unconsciously uses, forgetting that his readers might not know its deeper significance. He might have realised that he had written something not completely clear and deliberately retained it in a vague manner (because he did not wish to upset his readers by reminding them of the temple in Jerusalem which segregated them). He might have been tactful in case non-Christian Jews read his letter. If the tradition is correct that he is a prisoner (Eph. 3:1, 4:1), he might have a reason to be vague. If his letter were intended for Ephesus, he might not wish to upset his readers by reminding them of the temple in Jerusalem, which endangered the life of Trophimus.

The author has the law in mind, so it is possible he is thinking of an object or incident to illustrate this. We therefore look at various possibilities.

4.4.3.1 A barrier in the Jewish temple preventing Gentiles from having access to the shrine.

This has been a popular interpretation, whether the wall was still standing at the time of writing or had been destroyed.¹⁴⁵ It was generally assumed in exegesis before the discovery in 1871 of the inscription which forbade access to the Gentiles. This inscription has different words from those in Eph. 2:14, but it was a long time before exegetes began to waver from the traditional interpretation. Ellicott was one who expressed doubts.¹⁴⁶

Although/

Although Ephesians 2:14 does not have the word *δρύφακτος* from the inscription we cannot dismiss the possibility that we have the same idea, since all other suggestions have the same problem of different vocabulary. A reference to the barrier which separated the Court of the Gentiles from the Court of the Women seems so applicable for a letter, which although for a wider audience according to tradition has Ephesus in mind. Trophimus, whom Paul was accused of allowing to cross the barrier was from Ephesus (Acts 21:27-30). Tertullus accused Paul of profaning the temple, thus implying that Paul was trying to break down the middle wall (Acts 24:6).¹⁴⁷

There appears to be no unanimous agreement as to what the temple, its courts and walls actually looked like. It was only completed in 62-4 when Albinus was Procurator.¹⁴⁸ The holy inner Court was then renovated and a large gate was erected between the Court of the Women and the Court of Israel. Timber had been obtained for further building, but rebellion came in A.D. 66.¹⁴⁹

Josephus (Ant. 15:417. B. J. 5:193-206) describes a 5 x 35 feet stone balustrade (*δρύφακτος λίθινος*) which separated the outer Court of the Gentiles from the two stairs of fourteen and five steps, that led up to the platform where the temple proper stood. A Jew passing this balustrade came first to the Court of the Women, then the Court of the Sons of Israel and then the Court of the Priests. This whole area is often called the temple (*ἱερόν*) and the real shrine is called the *ναός*. The Gentiles who brought offerings were permitted to come to the balustrade, but the high wall at the top of the inner stairs prevented them from even looking at the other Courts. In this high wall were massive gates, with the "Beautiful" on the east. The Priest's section round the altar was marked off, and a further flight of steps led up to the shrine itself.¹⁵⁰ The barrier was not the high wall at the top but the low balustrade (about 5 feet according to Barth) which from a physical point of view could be crossed easily. Gentiles were warned in Greek and Latin inscriptions on bronze plaques¹⁵¹ fixed on pillars that capital punishment was imposed for trespassing beyond this low partition. The warning was heeded by the Roman authorities themselves.

A. Edersheim describes the Court of the Gentiles, or what the Rabbis called the Mount of the House, as being wider on the west side and more and more narrow respectively on the east, south and north. It was called the Chol or profane place, for Gentiles had access and would find the market place.¹⁵² The Court of the Gentiles was paved with variegated marble and was a rough square of 750 feet. In this court, tradition places the eating and sleeping apartments for the Levites, the money-changers' tables, etc. At the end of the court was the barrier or Soreg.

The significance of the Soreg is given in *M. Sanhedrin* 9:6, which says that the stranger who trespasses the Soreg "will die by the hand of God." *M. Kelim* 1.8 speaking of areas of increasing holiness says the Rampart (Chel) is holier, for neither idolaters, nor one who contracted corpse uncleanness may enter it. The Court of the Women is holier for no "tebal Yom" may enter it.¹⁵³

One Rabbinic reference to an earlier time is *M. Middoth* 2:3, which tells how the kings of the Greeks, the Seleucids, had made thirteen breaks through the Soreg. *1 Macc.* 9:54 records how Alcimus had ordered the destruction of the wall around the court of the temple. But both Antiochus Epiphanes and Pompey, who entered the Temple, died tragically not so long afterwards. Titus who finally destroyed the Temple did not survive long when he became emperor.

This threat of death is in contrast to Christ who does not kill those who wish to come, but invites Gentiles and makes it possible for them to come.

There was no real need for pagans to be offended by this restriction,¹⁵⁴ for in all ancient religions, as well as in Judaism, there were sanctuaries inaccessible to the ordinary worshipper and separated by a rail of wood or stone, e.g. the Periclean Entrance Court (the Propylae) of the Acropolis of Athens and Artemis' Sanctuary at Gerasa.¹⁵⁵ Bickermann shows that in Syria the whole plan of the temple was based on this idea. A series of fore-courts secluded the sanctum in the rear (or in the middle) of the complex. Warnings against the trespassing upon holy ground were placed at the gates leading to heathen temples. A stone block on Mt. Hermon had the notice "on the order of the greatest and holy/

holy God, from here (i.e. inwards) only the covenanters" (cf. Ps. 24:3).¹⁵⁶

Two inscriptions have been found which presumably come from Herod's temple. One is complete and is in the Archaeological Museum, Istanbul.¹⁵⁷ It was found by Clermont Ganneau and announced on 6 February 1871. He could not report his discovery in Paris because of the Franco-Prussian war, so he wrote a letter to the Athenaeum and later published a full discussion and facsimile in Revue Archeologique, xxiii (1872).¹⁵⁸

The inscription states:-

ΜΗΘΕΝΑΛΛΟΓΕΝΗΕΙΣΠΟ	ΦΘΗΕΑΥΤΩΑΙΤΙΟΕΕΣ
ΡΕΥΕΣΘΑΙΕΥΤΟΣΤΟΥΤΕ	ΤΑΙΔΙΑΤΟΕΞΑΚΟΛΟΥ
ΡΙΤΟΙΕΡΟΝΤΡΥΦΑΚΤΟΥΚΑΙ	ΘΕΙΝΘΑΝΑΤΟΝ
ΠΕΡΙΒΟΛΟΥΟΣΛΑΝΑΗ	

This means "no man of another nation to enter within the fence and enclosure around the temple, and whoever is caught will have himself to blame that his death ensues". It was found only 50 metres from the Haram es Shariff and utilized for repairs of the Medresse, probably in the 16th century. It is not absolutely certain that it comes from the time of Herod the Great, but it does confirm the exact scrupulous descriptions of Josephus. Another inscription was discovered over sixty years later and is in the Palestine Archaeological Museum, Jerusalem.

Accepting the fact that those who crossed the barrier unlawfully risked their lives, we must ascertain how this took place. The inscriptions do not give any information about legal procedure. We know that in 4 B.C. Herod ordered the punishment by death of those who tore down the golden eagle which he had erected over the great door of the temple,¹⁵⁹ but this was before the resumption of direct Roman rule under the Procurators. Some believe that punishment was left to the hand of heaven.¹⁶⁰ The inscription speaks of a person being caught. God would not have to wait for this, *ἑαυτῷ αἴτιος ἔσται* is an equivalent of *ἄτιόςθαί* which is a colloquialism meaning "or else".¹⁶¹

Jewish/

Jewish religious conviction would see nothing wrong in killing the offender (John 16:2).

Numbers 1:51 orders that the common man who comes near the temple be put to death. There is rabbinical evidence of death for those ministering at the altar in a state of impurity.¹⁶² Bickermann draws the parallel with Paul's friends in Ephesus, who were seized by a heathen multitude and brought into a popular assembly in the theatre as guilty of sacrilege against Artemis (Acts 19:29), but he does not mention Ephesians 2:14 as a possible parallel.

The writers of the inscription had to reconcile modern ideas of deliberate intention with the ancient principle of automatic action. In practice, execution of the sentence depended upon Levitic watchmen who acted as police in the temple.¹⁶³

We must enquire whether Jews at this time would be allowed to execute offenders. This is still disputed among scholars.¹⁶⁴ John 18:31 states (and the Synoptics appear to assume) that the Jews could try but could not execute. This appears to be correct.¹⁶⁵ There are evidences of trials (e.g. of Jesus) and of executions, where the authorities turned a blind eye to the mob.¹⁶⁶ The archaic procedure (Lev. 24:14-16, Deut. 17:7), of community action by stoning¹⁶⁷ would not easily be stamped out by legal enactments. It may well be that one governor allowed more latitude than others.¹⁶⁸

It would follow historical precedents if the Jews lost the "ius gladii" (the legal privilege of exercising capital punishment) in A.D. 6 when Judah became a Roman province.¹⁶⁹ Josephus (BJ 2.117) describes the first Roman Procurator Coponius as invested with the power of life and death by Caesar.¹⁷⁰ Barrett points out that a governor would have this authority, but that this does not mean that competent law courts were deprived of theirs.

In support of Jews being able to try and condemn is the fact that the Sanhedrin has all the necessary regulations.

The most satisfactory conclusion is that Jews could try and condemn, but the authority to execute remained with the Roman Procurator. He did not always interfere or retaliate when the Jews took the law into their own hands.

Thus/

Thus the temple barrier seems a likely interpretation of the middle wall, but there are the following objections:-

(a) Language.

None of the usual architectural terms are used in Ephesians 2:14. There were four terms: (i) τὸ ἱερόν, used of the whole complex or of the temple proper. The LXX avoided the pagan connotation by using ἄγιον but were less scrupulous after the Maccabean victory. (ii) ναός, used of the shrine itself. (iii) περιβόλος which was the wall that encompassed the holy terrace within the outer court (the LXX, Josephus and Philo (de Spec. leg. 1:71) use this word to describe the enclosure of the temple). (iv) δρύφακτος (ἡγίο) which we have seen was the stone barrier which stretched across the outer court to protect the flight of stairs leading up to the inner court and to which the warning inscriptions were fixed. Μεσότοιχον is never used in connection with any of these words.

(b) It was an unauthorised fence.

(c) Would the readers be expected to know about it?¹⁷¹

(d) Would the writer use the illustration if the temple were still standing? i.e. Would it be a valid argument?¹⁷²

(e) If it was not still standing, how relevant would it be?¹⁷³

(f) Would it be tactful? It would divide Jewish and Gentile Christians afresh, rather than heal, since we can scarcely envisage the Gentile readers keeping the letter to themselves. They would tell the Jews that the writer says "your wall has been removed".¹⁷⁴

Of these objections (a) is the only serious one but, as we have already observed, it is difficult for any suggestion as to what the middle wall might be. Perhaps because the author is using the idea for a theological meaning he does not use the more common term.

(b) is irrelevant. The fence was there with the inscription, whether it was legal or not. If written to the Ephesians, there was Trophimus to repeat ad nauseam what had happened to him. If Ephesians was originally a circular letter, the Trophimus incident related to 2:14 could be a reason why the letter became known as Ephesians.

(c) The readers would know the Old Testament¹⁷⁵ (unless they only had portions, e.g. the Testimonies). They would probably know of/

of the tabernacle, of Solomon's and Ezra's temples, also of Ezekiel's grandiose plans for the future.¹⁷⁶ They possibly knew of the tradition of the torn curtain in the temple itself. Ephesians 2 proceeds to mention the temple and a part of a building (the cornerstone).¹⁷⁷

(d) It makes a vivid illustration (cf. 1 Thess. 2:16, Mark 13) but is rather provocative when he is writing of Jew and Gentile being one (see f).

(e) The fact that it was no longer there, strengthens the argument that the barrier has been removed.¹⁷⁸

(f) is more serious, but Jewish-Christians were a minority and Jewish false teachers perhaps on the increase. John 2:22 depicts Jesus as deliberately giving the impression of the destruction of the temple.

The temple barrier¹⁷⁹ is therefore a possible illustration. It is not so obvious nor so widely accepted by exegetes as to preclude other possibilities, which we now tabulate despite Olshausen's warning that such investigation is a waste of time.¹⁸⁰ But since no suggestion receives total acceptance today, we must discuss any likely alternatives. The barrier cannot be safely used to date Ephesians,¹⁸¹ but if Ephesians is by Paul the barrier is more explicable than if the letter is by a later Paulinist. Paul as a Jew could cross the barrier, his Gentile disciples could not.

4.4.3.2 The fence around the law.

The clear connection of the middle wall with law (either in apposition to it, or to the hostility it causes) suggests we might think of the fence placed around the law by the tradition of the elders.¹⁸² The Rabbis described the violation of their teaching as reminiscent of breaking through the Sinai boundary. In the rabbinical document Pirke Aboth, which may contain elements from early New Testament times, there is the commandment to "build a fence around the law" ($\text{לְבַנּוֹת סָבִיב לַתּוֹרָה}$).¹⁸³

This probably describes rabbinical interpreters of the law and indicts false prophets like those in Ex. 13:10 for being critical of the abnormal growth of oral tradition and valuing it at the expense/

expense of what is written.¹⁸⁴ Rabbi Aqibah declared that the tradition is to be the fence around the law.¹⁸⁵

But this fence, if it were removed, would reveal the law not remove it, so it is not an apt illustration.

4.4.3.3 The law as a fence for Israel.

This idea like the former comes from the Sinai incident (Ex. 19:12) where a fence is erected to keep Israel and anything belonging to her from approaching the mountain. Through a spiritual interpretation, the boundary is understood as being around the consecrated people of Israel and to be the fence of the law. The Letter of Aristaeas says that Moses had fenced the Jews "with impregnable ramparts and walls of iron (περιέφραγεν ἡμᾶς ἀδιακύνοις Χάραξι καὶ σιδηροῖς τείχεσιν) in order that they might not mingle at all with any of the other nations but remain pure in body and soul, free from all vain imagination, worshipping the one almighty God above the whole creation. (139) He has hedged them on all sides through rules of purity (πάντοθεν ἡμᾶς περιέφραγεν ἀγνείας) (142)." Similar sentiments are found in 1 En. 93:6 "a law for all generations and an enclosure (i.e. Palestine) shall be made for them" (cf. 89:2 and 3 Macc. 3:4).

In Exodus, the law is to protect Israel from the wrath of a holy God. The Rabbis changed this to a protection from an evil world where the fence shows God's protection rather than his hostility. The shift to the protective sense was achieved by referring to Lev. 18:30. In the Sifre on that passage this idea is clearly seen. It is linked with Is. 5:1-2, where there is a fence around the vineyard Israel, and with Gen. 32:2, which has the angels at Mahanaim protecting the promised land.¹⁸⁶

In the post-Tannaitic writings, which although late may reflect early tradition, the fence is identified with God's law itself and has soteriological and cosmological functions. The law becomes "the wall of the wise", "the wall of the world" (Jer. Berakoth 6a, Lev. R. 76 124a). CD 1:16 accuses the wicked enemies of Qumran of removing the boundary.

This/

This interpretation fits the context well, but does not help us discover the illustration. We know that in Eph. 2:14 the barrier is related to law. What we do not know is whether the metaphor of the law as a hedge lies behind our word. The law is a wall in Lev. R. 26.

O. Betz may find a fine illustration of Jesus breaking through the wall and paying the penalty with his own life,¹⁸⁷ but Ex. 19:12 seems to have little connection with our text, since that wall excluded Israel and was a barrier between Israel and God. However the subsequent tradition of the law being fenced could lead the author of Ephesians to think of the barrier in the temple as a further example of Gentile restrictions.

4.4.3.4 The wall of paradise.

This concept comes from linking the barrier of Genesis 3, which prevented Adam and Eve from returning to Eden and which was caused by the sin of the serpent, with Eccles. 10:8. This says "a serpent will bite him, who breaks through the wall". Lev. R. 26 says "the serpent was first to break through the hedge of the world and therefore become the executioner for all". It cites Rabbi Schemuel ben Nachman, cir. 260, as saying "one said to the serpent, why are you found between the wall (הַיִּתְּרֵךְ)?". It answered "because I have broken through the hedge of the world".¹⁸⁸

The Syrian Father Aphraates (Hom. 23.370f) says "through the fall there stands a hedge between men and the tree of life. Men cannot surmount this wall, but the tree can spread its branches wide" (cf. Gen. 49:22). We saw on p.94 that this thought is found in The Acts of Thomas 32 and Acts of Philip 48:10ff. It is alluded to in the Horos of the Valentinians and in the *φραγμός κακίας* of the Ophites (mentioned by Origen (c. Cels. 6:31)) and by the Mandaeans (LG 430:21)

4.4.3.5 The veil.

At first this seems very attractive and reminds us of Mk. 15:38 and Hebrews 10:20, which shows it is something the death of Christ has torn¹⁸⁹ apart. Support can be found in the Gospel of Philip/

Philip, "Its veil was rent from top to the bottom, for it was fitting for some from below to go upward" (76). It was rent not just below and above but "from the top to the bottom. Those from above opened for us, who are from below that we might enter into the secret of the truth" (125). (The Holy of Holies is understood as the bridal chamber.)¹⁹⁰

Heracleon regards the Temple of 2:19-22 as the house of God at present divided. The psychics dwell in the outer court separated by a veil from the pneumatics who dwell with Christ.¹⁹¹

We cannot be certain that Ephesians knew of this tradition and it is unsatisfactory for our purpose since the veil, like the Sinai fence kept Jews away as well as Gentiles.¹⁹² However the writer of Ephesians could have adapted it, just as he adapts Is. 57:19. He uses the word access in 2:18, which is characteristic of Hebrews.

4.4.3.6 The peculiarity of Israel.

The wall may refer to the general peculiarity of Israel,¹⁹³ rather than the specific fence around the law, which was discussed in 4.4.3.2. Israel regarded herself as a distinct people separated from others.¹⁹⁴

The Song of the Vineyard (Is. 5:2; cf. Mt. 21:33) has Israel set apart in a special way.¹⁹⁵ Jewish particularism is well-known, although it is doubtful if one can see its refutation as the specific purpose of the book of Ruth (a Moabitess becomes the ancestress of David). It is clear in Ezra's and Nehemiah's attitude to mixed marriages and possibly in Jonah.¹⁹⁶ The Qumran Community considered itself as something sacred, as an eternal plantation (IQS 8:4ff) a holy temple (IQS 5:5ff, 8:4ff, 9:3ff) with a boundary or wall (CD 1:16, 19). Transgressions of the law are breaches opened in the wall of the law (CD 20:25).¹⁹⁷

4.4.3.7 The law itself.

This has been seen already in the Letter of Aristeas and many think that here we have the parallel. This is undoubtedly what the wall illustrates, since our passage elucidates the metaphor by referring to/

to "the law of commandments contained in ordinances". But this does not answer the question as to what the original meaning of the term used by the author would be. The original meaning of *νόμος* was not the law.¹⁹⁸

The law acted as a barrier in two ways. On the one hand it protected Israel, on the other hand it kept the Gentiles outside.¹⁹⁹ The law of Moses with all its details formed a wall. This very wall is torn down. Verse 12 made it clear that the Gentiles were once kept away from Jewish citizenship, constituted through the law.²⁰⁰

There is a gnostic link here, for heterodox-Jewish circles showed an increasing tendency to identify the law and the powers.²⁰¹ H. Schlier thinks that partly under such influence²⁰² the classic second-century gnosticism developed, when the law and the cosmic guardians were no longer distinguished. Schlier goes so far as to assume that Ephesians 2:14, 15 presupposes their complete identification and that Paul preaches the simultaneous destruction of the powers and the law. However Ephesians does not explicitly identify the powers with the law in the way that Gal. 4:3 does.²⁰³

A New Testament understanding is that the law was intended, as a hedge or fence to shut in or shut out (Gal. 2:18). Now the partition has served its purpose, having been fulfilled when the Messiah appeared. "To prolong the separation now, could only be mischievous and would frustrate the establishment of the universal kingdom of the Messiah."²⁰⁴

4.4.3.8 A temple in Ephesus or elsewhere in Asia Minor.

A letter to Ephesus or written (perhaps in Ephesus) to churches in Asia centred on that city would mean that an Ephesian temple would be relevant. There was the famous temple of Diana or Artemis²⁰⁵ and also the earlier worship of the local manifestation of the mother-goddess by the Carians, long before the Ionians came. Probably as early as 2,000 B.C. the inhabitants possessed a sacred stone, believed to have fallen from Zeus or heaven. The Greeks called the stone *Διωνητής* (Acts 19:35). The hard wooden image of the goddess became more and more elaborated with gold and silver plating. Aprons of udderlike breasts were put on.

The Temple of Paul's day, which was the fifth on the site, was built following the burning of the previous one²⁰⁶ in 356 B.C. It had an identical plan to the earlier one, except it was more elaborate and on a higher platform. It was four times as large as the Parthenon.²⁰⁷ Since it was a temple with a shrine and a priesthood, there would be some kind of barrier.

The naos was surrounded by pillars in the temple and the whole was enclosed within a large park, forming a sanctuary.²⁰⁸

Few scholars, even in the days when "Ephesians" was more widely accepted as having been written to that church, have linked this temple with Eph. 2:14, for prior to the 1871 discovery of the inscription the Jerusalem temple would be assumed. G.C. Martin mentions that the splendour of Diana's building has been suggested as lying behind the allegory in 1 Cor. 3 and the language of Eph. 2:20, 21.²⁰⁹ The Town Clerk of Ephesus calls the city the temple keeper (*νεωκόρου* Acts 19:35).

Asia Minor had other temples, e.g. at Pergamum²¹⁰ the temple of Aphrodite at Aphrodisias, which had the right of asylum given to it by Julius Caesar, Augustus, Tiberius and others. Even if the writer is referring to the temple in Jerusalem, temple imagery would not be something completely strange to pagan Ephesian readers. This could prevent him from having any inhibitions about using the illustration known to him from a far away land.²¹¹

The pattern of Greek temples in general developed greatly in the second half of the seventh century, but then for a millennium there was little change. Although Greek religion changed considerably from the temple being the centre of popular worship to being the centre of civil religion, while real religion was that of the Mystery, yet the principle of the temple remained the same.²¹² This was largely because the temple housed the image of the god and little else. The weather in that part of the world is favourable so sacrifices and other cultic activities could safely take place in the open. But clearly access to the shrine would have some kind of restriction, that is a barrier, which Ephesians could possibly have in mind.

The/

The Jewish temple prevented people from access because of their foreign nationality. Elsewhere, especially in the Greek world, it would be because of uncleanness. People could be excluded for political reasons. But there is hardly a text saying that foreigners as such were not allowed to enter a Greek sanctuary.²¹³ Greek and native pilgrims now freely mixed in oriental sanctuaries.²¹⁴ Zeus of Panamara in Caria called "all men" to his mystical festivals and promised equal honours to all "at the sacred temple".²¹⁵ Thus the exclusiveness of the Jews in regard to their temple would be seen as an aspect of their general isolationism.

There was no religious-social caste in Greece; the priest was chosen by lot or election and was a public officer. The devotee participated in worship by reason of his being a member of a social group. The sources of impurity were external (e.g. child-birth, death). In 19 B.C. the date of the Eleusinian Mysteries was brought forward to allow for the initiation of a Hindu.²¹⁶ But in the time of Isocrates both murderers and non-Greeks were barred.²¹⁷

In one sense, the whole Jewish nation was priestly. They were the only nation which as a whole submitted to the requirements of ritual purity. "The same barrier between sacred and profane, which separated the ceremonially clean in Greece from others and marked off the priestly caste in the orient, set Israel apart from other nations."²¹⁸ Thus in Jerusalem laymen took sacrifices to the altar, they observed the sacrifices and represented the people of Israel. People were not excluded because they were foreigners as such, but because they did not belong to the priestly race. In other religions the sancta was inaccessible to the crowd, not because of nationality, but because the crowd formed the laity.

The New Testament teaches that Jesus ends this division and makes his followers a kingdom of priests (Rev. 1:6).

4.4.3.9 The barrier of Hades.

Eusebius has the term *φραγμός* in his description of Abgar of Edessa's request to Jesus to visit him. "Thomas therefore sent Thaddeus who preached about Christ's coming and mission, how Christ humbled/

humbled and emptied and abased himself" καὶ ἑσταυρώθη καὶ κατέβη
 εἰς τὸν Ἅιδην καὶ διέσχισε φραγρὸν τὸν ἐξ αἰῶνος
 καὶ σχισθέντα καὶ ἀνήγειρεν νεκροὺς καὶ κατέβη ῥόνος
 ἀνέβη δὲ μετὰ πολλοῦ ὄχλου. (HE 1:13)

This legend probably arose as support for Edessa's claim to be a church with an ancient tradition going back to the time of the apostles. This does not seem directly relevant, but is valuable for possible links between Ephesians and a gnostic cosmic wall. The reference to Hades may recall Eph. 1:20, 4:9 and 5:14. We cannot be certain if Thaddeus had any other particular barrier in mind when he speaks of the barrier of Hades.

4.4.4 A cosmic barrier.

Many people in the ancient world believed in such a barrier and Ephesians hints at the world being in the iron control of evil powers. Their home was in the seven planets, based on astronomical ideas of spheres inside of each other creating barriers between man on earth and God in heaven.²¹⁹ By Paul's time "virtually everyone believed in the existence of these beings (intermediaries) whether he called them demons or angels or simply spirits. This meant that a soul had a dangerous journey through the planetary spheres to heaven. There would also be a war between the heavenly and earthly spheres as in Iranian and later in gnostic mythology.

F.C. Baur²²⁰ was the first to suggest a gnostic influence in Eph. 2:14 and more recently H. Schlier has enlarged upon the concept of the redeemer who destroys the hostile wall (or fortress, or wall of fire, or iron) between the godhead and those who are to be redeemed. In his commentary, Schlier has found connections in Jewish cosmic conceptions of the law.

Beneath the Pauline layer is "the description of" the descent and ascent of the heavenly Urmensch (redeemer) who on his descent breaks through the cosmic wall, destroys the hostility in the earthly region, unites all the faithful with himself and finally leads them "back into the heavenly pleroma".²²¹ Schlier and Kasemann²²² therefore see a dependence upon gnosticism and also a correction of it.

Schlier/

Schlier begins his evidence²²³ with the Christian writer Ignatius, who uses similar terminology.²²⁴ While this has parallels to the Eusebian quotation, the latter according to Schlier is too different to be dependent upon the former. The only real link between the two passages is the word *φραγμός*. Since both Ignatius and Eusebius seem to be talking about the same thing - a breaching of Hades - and only Ignatius appears to use Ephesians, Schlier thinks it is likely that we have the use here of a wider terminology that links up with the later references which can be found in the gnostic literature.

Schlier gives Mandaean parallels²²⁵ which would not be expected to have the Greek words *περίτοιχον* or *σπύφαντος* in any case. There is the danger when another language is used to find parallels much more easily than we can in the same language. The problem with Ephesians 2:14 is not that we do not have similar ideas of walls and barriers. We have seen that we have these in abundance. The problem is that we do not have any examples of *περίτοιχον*. When we use Mandaean and Coptic parallels, we give evidence which avoids such linguistic problems.²²⁶

We are not encouraged to look for parallels when we read C.H. Dodd's observations on Mandaeanism as "an extraordinary farrago of theology, myth, fairy tale, ethical instruction, ritual ordinances and what purports to be history".²²⁷ There is no real unity or consistency of thought, but basically there is a dualistic view of the universe with a realm of light and a realm of darkness, and a demiurge or creator called Ptahil. The soul is a prisoner in this world until death, when it will reach the realm of light where God dwells, if it succeeds in passing a whole chain of guardhouses inhabited by hostile demons who seek to capture it. The soul in this life must be equipped for the journey by repeated baptisms in running water.

There is also a redeemer myth of Manda d'Hayye (meaning gnosis of life) or of his son Hibil who descends and fights the powers of darkness led by Ruha and the planets that rule over the world before overcoming the demons at the guardhouses on his ascent to reunion with the Great Life.

There are many striking parallels in the Right Ginza, which however in its present form is late, having references to Mohammed. Schlier cites the Mandaean Liturgy²²⁸ which is perhaps the oldest dated text (third or fourth century A.D.). This includes sections for baptisms and masses for the dead. Schlier thinks it is similar to the Acts of Thaddeus. "The man who springs from Tibil knocks a cleft in the house in which the sad ones await him."

In the Left Ginza the same man knocks a cleft in the fortress, which holds the sad ones. "A noble uthra was sent to me, a man who is outstanding in the world ... He smashed their watchhouses and made a breach in their fortress and the Seven fled from his path. He brought radiance and clothed me in it and brought me forth with glory from the world. They all sit in lamentation for the man who has escaped from the Tibil and made a breach in their fortress and was brought (or they brought him) forth with glory from the world". (GL 3 15 Foerster) "The Redeemer says to the soul "I shall guide you past the watchhouse at which the rebels stand."

In this wall, this wall of iron (Lidzbarski "which encircles the world like a wreath") I shall hack a breach for you" (GL 3;25). Schlier refers to RG 372.25ff. "Er schlug gegen ihr (der Bösen) Firmament und spaltete darin einen Spalt."

Other suggested Mandaean parallels do not seem relevant. "I showed her (Ruha) a third mystery and split her head open with a blow" (RG111). "However when the wicked said this, I made a breach in their phalanx (RG112). The others give a plausible interpretation, but they are such late evidence, since even early Mandaean is late. The idea is not found in their early writing on lead strips or on the magic bowls. If there is any connection it is more likely to be a development rather than the seed of the original thought. Schlier does not cite LG3:56. "He sent a man to me, who made me hear his voice. He opened the doors for me and came, he split the firmament and revealed himself. He opened the doors and came" nor GR15:11 which refers to the walls of Jerusalem. "I destroyed the city of Jerusalem, in which the blood of my disciples was poured out, I slew the Jews" (destroying pillars on the outer and inner walls).

Gnostic/

Gnostic writings have references to barriers, e.g. the anonymous and untitled writing referred to by Lindemann,²²⁹ 146:22 has a *παρὰνέταστρον* separating men and heaven.

The Acts of Thomas 32: (cited p.94) speaks of the dragon breaking through the hedge into paradise. This is the thought we discussed under 4.4.3.4. It is easy to see how this could be given a cosmic reference.

The Gospel of Philip 76: "Its veil was rent from the top to the bottom, for it was fitting for some from below to go upward" (the holy of holies being the bridal chamber). This passage is interesting in showing that a change from a vertical to a horizontal barrier caused no problem.

The Acts of Philip 48:10ff (cited on p.94). 55:3ff *καὶ τὸν Βαρβολοραῖον ἐκτείναντες ἀπέναντι τοῦ φιλήπου ἐπερόνησαν τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ τοίχῃ τῆς πύλης τοῦ ἱεροῦ*

132:6f has a reference to Hades as *αἰὼν τοῦ φραγροῦ*

The Psalms of Thomas depict the soul as the sister of the Aeons of light who represent peace, but the devils "liessen nicht ab; mich zu bekämpfen, bis dass sie eine Mauer gegen mich gebaut hatten" (2:17) "meine Brüder erhoben sich wurden eins mit (mir). Durch einen blossen Ruf, den meine Brüder ausstiessen, erzitterte ihre Mauer und fiel um" (2:24b, 25).²³⁰ 1:2 speaks of the Aeon of peace.

Excerpta ex Theodotus 37 οἱ ἀπὸ Ἀδάμ ἐξεληθόντες οἱ μὲν δίκαιοι διὰ τῶν ἐκτισμένων τὴν ὁδὸν ποιούμενοι παρὰ τῇ τόπῃ κατεῖχοντο κατὰ τοὺς θαλεντινιανούς. οἱ δὲ ἕτεροι ἐν τῇ τοῦ σκότους ἐκτισμένῃ ἐν τοῖς ἀρίστεροις ἔχοντες συνανίσθησαν τοῦ πυρός.

The entire 1 James Apocalypse (NHC v.3) is a reference to how Jesus can accomplish the ascent through the heavens of the Archons to the place of peace. This knowledge the gnostic does not gain by himself; first the redeemer himself from above has broken through the wall to preach to the gnostics.

The Hypostasis of the Archons (NH 2.94) says "There is a curtain (cf. The Gospel of Philip 76 and 125) between those above and the aeons which are below. And a shadow came into existence below the curtain and that shadow became matter".

In the Hermetic Literature "die Mauer ... die die Welt Gottes hermetische von der Welt der Menschen abtrennte, wird vom Verfasser auf das mosiasche Gesetz bezogen".²³¹

The Odes of Solomon²³² 17:8ff say "I opened the doors which were closed and shattered the bars of iron ... and nothing appeared closed to me because I was the opening of everything". The Ode concludes with words which are applicable to our context, "And they became members to me and I their head".

There are earlier Jewish references to a cosmic, if not a gnostic wall. 1 Enoch 14:9 has a heavenly wall, which separates the heavenly from the earthly sphere. There are also references to a wall in Qumran, e.g. CD 4:10ff (Schlier 6:7ff). "The wall (הגדר) is built, the law is distant". Schlier finds five references to הגדר in QH, but in none does the wall function to separate the Jews from others.²³³ גדר which means enclosure (i.e. what is surrounded, fenced or walled) is found only at CD 4:12.²³⁴

This list, most of which is referred to by Schlier is impressive, but it is also very broad with the Jewish referring to the law and paradise and the gnostic to a barrier above this world, a horizon or limit separating this world from the divine pleroma. The composite list is Christian, Jewish and Gnostic, from different countries and centuries, both early and late. Schlier acknowledges it is a wide variety, but assumes that the same myth lies behind these apocalyptic, rabbinic and gnostic references.²³⁵ Kasemann goes further, in believing that φραγμός in gnosis was originally the flesh which separated God and man. Christ's death on the cross meant that the flesh was removed as in circumcision.²³⁶

In favour of Schlier's hypothesis are the following:-

- a) It explains the juxtaposition in Eph. 2:14-17 of images of wall, body, new man, building, which are used in gnostic imagery. It also has the advantage of linking the two kinds of relationship, man to man and man to God. Interpreters have had so much/

much difficulty because they have not realised the author was using gnostic ideas for what is not in accord with gnosticism.

- b) Schlier's more recent emphasis upon Jewish cosmic thought²³⁷ means that he can find sources nearer to the time of Ephesians rather than much later ones, such as the Mandaean.²³⁸ Gnika's strongpoint is also that he finds Jewish rather than Gnostic parallels, particularly Apocalyptic writings like Enoch 14:9 as well as the cosmic separating wall known in Hermetic literature.
- c) He shows the author uses the language because it is part of the conceptual world in which his readers live.²³⁹ It is always a useful line of attack to use the weapons of an opponent. It is possible for the writer of Ephesians to use gnostic ideas in his argument, because he negates them with the verb *καταργήσας*. The gnostic redeemer myth, if it were early enough would be admirably suited to show how creation and redemption are joined in Christ, since the basic feature of the myth is the identity of the primal man and the redeemer.²⁴⁰
- d) It was theologically advantageous to use gnostic ideas, since it was easier with them, rather than with those of Jewish apocalypticism to affirm the unity of the church.²⁴¹
- e) It overcomes the problem that his readers would not understand the unusual word for the temple barrier.

But against it being cosmic are the following:-

- a) The barrier in the Jewish works, Enoch 14:9, Test XII Levi 2:7, Greek Baruch 2:1ff, Syr Bar 54:5 (a wall which kept men from divine mysteries) is not said to be destroyed.
- b) The barrier is found in different places such as heaven, earth, hades.
- c) The word *περίτοιχον* is never used except in Ignatius, which suggests he derived it from reading Ephesians.²⁴²
- d) If a barrier between earth and heaven is implied, it is through the exposition of Ps. 68:18. But if it is implied in Eph. 4:8ff no stress is laid upon it.²⁴³
- e) No reference to a cosmic barrier can be found in the New Testament.

f)/

- f) Would the readers understand the reference to a gnostic barrier any more than they would a reference to the temple? One might be part of their culture, the other is definitely part of their Christian heritage from the Old Testament.
- g) The thought of the reconciliation of the heavenly and earthly spheres is unthinkable in gnosis, since the material is alien to the spiritual.
- h) For gnostic interpreters of Eph. 2:14, the barrier refers to the Jerusalem temple symbolising the separation of the hylics and psychics from the place of the pneumatics (the Holy of Holies).²⁴⁴ The gnostics claim to be the only legitimate interpreters of Paul.²⁴⁵ "Perhaps because gnostics refer so often to the wall of partition in the temple in explicating Eph. 2:14 orthodox avoid this identification" until the sixteenth century.²⁴⁶
- i) The disarming of the Principalities and Powers was on the cross not in Hades.

In view of these difficulties, all that can be said is that a Jewish cosmic barrier is a probability. A gnostic one is only possible if gnosticism is pre-Christian in origin or contemporary. However all our gnostic evidence is late.

We know that some of the ingredients of gnosticism had antecedents in Judaism and Zoroastrianism and that ideas of the real world above and of the inferior world of matter are present in Platonism, but the question is whether the second century heresies were the consequence of attempts to superimpose alien philosophical elements on a Christian substratum or whether they were systems which resulted from fitting bits of Christianity into a prior religious entity, which might take several different forms and could assimilate Mithras, Attis or Judaism.²⁴⁷ Was there an underlying myth of a descending redeemer which gave to Christianity many of its ideas of redemption?²⁴⁸

D. Smith suggests that Ephesians and the Gnostics use the same traditional material, forming different theological interpretations.²⁴⁹

Before his work on Ephesians, Schlier had attempted to demonstrate the influence of pre-Valentinian and Mandaean type gnosticism upon Ignatius.²⁵⁰

Gnosticism/

Gnosticism as a detailed system with a redeemed-redeemer is unlikely to be pre-Christian,²⁵¹ but on the other hand it would not begin in isolation from preceding thought. There would be many first century ideas which would become part of second-century gnosticism.²⁵² It is therefore possible that there is a reference to a pre-gnostic Jewish cosmic barrier,²⁵³ but the temple barrier despite its difficulties is more satisfactory than any other, favoured also by the fact that Eph. 2:19-22 refers to the temple. The resulting community of the union of Gentile and Jewish Christian is compared to the house and temple of God. Jew and Gentile had access in the new temple announced by the prophets.

4.4.5 What the wall illustrates.

This is shown in the words that follow, but depends very much on the punctuation of the passage and whether enmity refers to wall or to law.

Clement of Alexandria understood the wall as between Jew and Gentile²⁵⁴ and this was followed later in the west (e.g. Tertullian).²⁵⁵ At first the West like Eastern interpreters followed Origen and located it between earth and heaven.²⁵⁶ This continued to be the main interpretation in the East. Chrysostom regarded it as between God and man.²⁵⁷ The hostility in the flesh is a common barrier separating us from God. Because the Jews disobeyed the law, it no longer kept the Jews secure but cut them off from God as well. Ambrose saw it not only as between Jew and Gentile but as actually within the individual.²⁵⁸ In the Middle Ages, Aquinas takes the wall to be the law, but involves both Gentiles and Jews.²⁵⁹ Scholars of that era knew Latin rather than Greek and therefore most followed the Latin Fathers and placed the wall between Jew and Gentile.

The middle wall in the context of 2:14 is between the "two" which must be Jew and Gentile, irrespective of whether in a previous gnostic song it was between man and God. The gnostic barrier by the very essentials of gnostic teaching may be broken through, but never removed. The distinction between the heavenly and the material remains. The division between Jew and Gentile is one that Christ has taken away completely.

4.5 Δύσας

The verb can mean:-

- a) Set free, e.g. Homer uses of unharnessing horses. It is used of setting free from prison and by ransom. This last use is in the New Testament (Acts 24:26). Rev. 1:5 speaks of being loosed from sin. It is used of bonds in Rev. 20:3 and, since laws are binding, we find it used in John 7:23, Mt. 5:19 and John 5:18. This meaning hardly suits the present context since it is not the wall that is set free but those restrained by it.
- b) It has the sense of demolish in Acts 27:41 and John 2:19²⁶⁰ (cf. 1 Esdras 1:52). This is the fundamental meaning here. The wall no longer remains.

In the New Testament, the word is often in composite form, e.g. for the destruction of the temple or the abrogation of the law. When O. Betz suggests that Jesus breaks down the law and destroys rather than simply making a break,²⁶¹ it would be better if *καταλύσας* were used. But the writer may not use the stronger word here because he wishes to build up the emphasis as he proceeds. The force of the passage certainly suggests "demolished", rather than "breached", as in the Mandaean passages. Gnllka finds a reference to the destruction of the separating cosmic wall through the descent of the redeemer from the world of God.

It is the aorist tense suggesting the actual, historical, completed destruction of the obstacle.²⁶² It is a fact, Christ has died. He has broken down the barrier in principle.²⁶³ Since this is so, the Ephesians must work it out in practice.

Jesus broke the wall down by his passive act of dying, not by an active deed. "When he went up to the Passover, he was indignant at the use of the Gentile Court as a cattle market. But he did not break down the wall or bid St. Andrew or St. Philip to invite the Greek seekers to come up into the Court beyond."²⁶⁴

CHAPTER FIVE. 2:14c-15a

τὴν ἔχθραν ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ τὸν νόμον τῶν ἐντολῶν
ἐν δόγμασιν καταργήσας

So far, we have been told that Christ, who is our peace, has made two entities (Jews and Gentiles) one, destroying the barrier (illustrated by the temple balustrade) that separated the two groups.

In this chapter we must ascertain not only what the words of this section mean but whether all these words relate to the participle *καταργήσας* or if any of the words relate more directly to *λύσας* in the previous section. We do so without any prior assumption of an earlier draft which did not have some of the words. Since there is no external evidence for such a draft and no hymn has been found, we need only raise the possibility if the text does not give a coherent meaning as it stands.¹

5.1 τὴν ἔχθραν

ἔχθρα in the New Testament is the opposite of love and friendship and is akin to hatred. It is an inward attitude, directed in a negative fashion towards another, e.g. hostility existed between Herod and Pilate (Lk. 23:12). It is a work of the flesh (Gal.5:20).

The LXX has *ἔχθρος* more than four hundred and fifty times, usually for *יָחַד*. Israel believes that since she is God's people her enemies must be God's enemies, so the hatred is deepened.² Like the kindred word *χίψ* (LXX *μισέω*)³ it is used with theological connotations in Mal. 1:2, 3 (cf. *יָחַד* in Is. 63:10).

In 2:14 the word has the article so some specific hostility is probably in mind. Presumably it is in contrast to the peace and reconciliation mentioned in the passage and also linked in some way to the barrier.

It is dependent on either *λύσας* (with or without "in his flesh") or upon *καταργήσας* with in his flesh belonging to the same clause.⁴ Whichever of these possibilities is true, there does seem to be some connection or development of thought between wall, enmity, flesh and law.

If/

If dependent on λύσας, it is easy to see how a barrier causes division and hostility which are the opposite to peace. If on καταργήσας, one can understand how the law was causing enmity between Jew and Gentile. But it is not easy to maintain that this hostility is actually in Christ's flesh. Was it through some battle within Christ's person?⁵ Was it an internal foe which he overcame, a temptation to avoid the cross, a struggle to keep the law and not succumb to a non-fulfilment of its demands? There is little evidence that Paul thought in this way although this kind of thinking is in Heb. 5:7, 10:7, John 11:33-35, Jn. 12:27.⁶ Flesh seems more likely to be parallel to "cross" in v.16 (perhaps also a parallel to "blood", "in his person" and "in one spirit") and therefore a reference to his death. Whether dependent upon λύσας or καταργήσας, ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ appears to be the instrument "by his flesh".

Our difficulty is that the meaning of the words depends upon the punctuation and the punctuation is dictated by the probable meaning of the words. All we can do is to start with one possibility and then look at the alternatives to see which appears to give the better sense.⁷

A clue may be found in v.16 where ἀποκτείνας τὴν ἔχθραν ἐν αὐτῷ suggests that it is parallel to λύσας τὴν ἔχθραν ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ. Both passages would mean that Christ himself, or by something he has done, has removed the enmity. The second passage refers to the hostility between man and God as well as between Jew and Gentile, since reconciliation to God is definitely mentioned in the previous clause. In vv. 14, 15 it is not likely that reconciliation to God is directly in mind,⁸ for the immediate context is about the hostility between two parties who were separated by the middle wall. The fundamental thought, therefore, is of hostility between Jew and Gentile. The writer would find it impossible to separate from the deeper enmity between man and God, which was the cause of the trouble, the removal of which necessitated the temporary stage of a barrier between Jew and Gentile. What the enmity was in the original metaphor is quite secondary.⁹ What the barrier represents in the Ephesian context is what matters.

We conclude that the hostility our author is thinking about in this verse, is the division between Jew and Gentile.¹⁰ Enmity is probably/

probably to be directly linked with middle wall rather than with law. The law was not the enmity, only the occasion of it.¹¹

"The hatred and variance were occasioned by the existence of a peculiar people and the enjoyment of exclusive privilege."¹²

Jews would have so regarded it, but Gentiles would have looked upon it as a dubious privilege.¹³

Hostility was known in two directions as the following evidence shows.

5.1.1 Hostility of Jew toward Gentile.

This was caused by theological separation and by harsh treatment received from Gentiles. Basically Jews loved everyone¹⁴ and believed in a stranger's right to food, clothing and shelter (cf. Lev. 19:34). But even when no animosity was felt, the Jew kept himself apart; he was "always different, always separate, always exclusive".¹⁵ This attitude is very old in Jewish tradition. Even before the law was received, Isaac had no say in the choice of his bride, who must come from his own people (Gen. 24). The redemption from Egypt and the receiving of the law emphasised this particularity, which developed still further after the return from exile in Babylon. The reforms of Ezra and Nehemiah stressed that they were the people of the law.

Post-exilic Judaism oscillated between the two poles of universalism and exclusivism. On the former, more positive side, we have the mission of the servant and of Israel to the nations. Trito-Isaiah presents the conversion of the nations as a participation in the cult of the Temple of Jerusalem (Is. 56:6-7, 60:7 cf. Hag. 2:7-9). On the exclusive side, Daniel and his three friends are virtuous because they have no table communion with the Babylonians (Dan. 1:8). Tobit prides himself on his particularism (1:10-12, 4:12. cf. Job 22:16, 30: 1-13).¹⁶ This attitude inevitably caused mutual hatred and disdain.

The animosity is seen in the Old Testament, even in hatred for Edomites, whom Israel regarded as children of Esau and therefore descendants of Abraham.¹⁷ W.D. Davies shows that as early as Habakkuk (605-600 B.C?) the tendency had arisen to set the hostile Gentile/

Gentile nations over against the "Israel of God".¹⁸ Ezekiel (38 and 39) portrays the destruction of the Gentile armies of Gog and when speaking of the restoration of Israel (37) he does not extend the hope to the Gentiles in the way that Jeremiah does (Jer. 16:19; 12:16, 17).

Jewish pride would be very provocative, but any Jewish hatred of Gentile neighbours in Palestine would naturally increase after Antiochus Epiphanes.¹⁹ Their reaction to Gentile opposition is seen in Judith, Esther, Daniel and 1 and 2 Maccabees.

Qumran takes this hatred one stage further (IQS 1:4-10, 9:21 and 2:4-10.²⁰ If the Qumran community professed implacable hatred to the enemies within Israel, it would certainly show it to the pagans, even if they were not apostates but simply blind.²¹

When the Jews finally won their freedom, their hatred would diminish a little but with defeat in the A.D. 66-73 war enmity became irrevocable. This war to the end took a point of no return in Sept. 66 when the Jews killed all the Romans in the Antonia Garrison.²² Long after the war, the synagogues in A.D. 85 inserted a test clause into their daily congregational prayers known as the 18 Benedictions. This clause which cursed Nazarenes and heretics enabled Christians to be detected by their silence and meant they could not participate in Jewish synagogue worship.²³ The definite breach with Christians (and Gentiles) came after the failure of the Bar Cochba revolt. When Jews refused to recognise Jesus as Messiah, they naturally attacked Christians with bitterness for claiming to take over their prerogatives.²⁴ They may have hated Jewish co-patriots who were Christians more than they disliked Gentiles.

Rabbinical evidence shows this animosity,²⁵ although much would be precaution. Suspicion would soon lead to hatred, although unconsciously Jews had been accepting many Hellenistic ideas.²⁶

Christian Jews would carry aspects of this exclusiveness with them into Christianity, but a change soon came. The New Testament writers were mostly Jews but, as far as we know, none of the Church Fathers was a Jew. The Jewish-Christians became a small minority.²⁷

In/

In the period before A.D. 70,²⁸ the tensions within Jewish thought were reflected also in the beginnings of Christian theology. The early conflict is seen in Acts 6:1. Jews would show this hostility to Christians. They were active in Polycarp's martyrdom which is said to be their usual practice.²⁹ Bar Cochba is said to have harried the Christians.³⁰ This was only a small part of the hostility that Christians received, since Christians were soon predominantly Gentiles and the Jews had no political power.

5.1.2 Gentile hatred towards the Jew.

This aspect of enmity would be partly an expression of retaliation and partly sheer frustration with folk who insisted they were not only separate but superior. Gentiles would be unlikely to sit back when statements were made like "every Israelite is worth as much as all people together".³¹

After the battle of Panium in 198 B.C., the Jews had to pay the Seleucidae one third of their crops.³² It is well-known how Antiochus IV banned sabbath observance and circumcision and placed a statue of Zeus in the temple. There were persecutions and pogroms which have continued until this century. The friends of Antiochus VII (Sidetes), forgetting that Antiochus IV had shown the same exclusiveness in reverse, urged him to exterminate the Jews because "alone of all nations they refuse all fellowship and intercourse with other nations and suppose all men to be enemies".³³

What was offensive about Christianity in the eyes of the Gentiles was to a considerable extent its inheritance from Judaism, whereas the Jews could not help it, through accident of birth. Ep Barnabas 14:3-4 says the original tablets of the covenant of the Lord were shattered at Sinai and that Israel had never an authentic covenant with God. Christians adopted Abraham as the father of the faithful (Eus H E 1.4.6). They altered the day of the Sabbath (Ign Magn 9:1) and fast days (Did. 8:1) and treated other Jewish customs as from anti-Christ. The sabbath change had a theological reason, but there was no theological reason why fast days had to be different,³⁴ except to ensure that the days were not in close proximity to the first day of the week. Jesus had been against the/

the Pharisees (the popular leaders) who were represented by the elder son (Lk. 15) or the workers who said they would work but did not go into the vineyard.³⁵ The Acts and John are both more favourable to the Romans than they are to the Jews.³⁶

Whenever Ephesians was written, whether before or after A.D. 70, relationship might be amicable within the church, but outside of the church and in contact with Jews it would be different. "In a world which was rather proud of its universal philanthropy" due to the influence of Stoic philosophy, the Jew with his arrogant isolationism came necessarily to be regarded as "the enemy of the human race" and to be treated accordingly.³⁷ Under Domitian, tax was exacted with great severity in line with his general attitude as the determined opponent of the Jews. The conversion to Judaism was punished with heavy penalties.³⁸ Gnosticism also became anti-Jewish and the inferior demiurge is identified with the god of the Jews.³⁹ The metaphor for the psychics who were the lowest class in the Gnostic division of mankind was Jew.⁴⁰

But the New Testament as a whole, as well as Eph. 2:15, has a wider vision. We have the paradox of Jesus' narrowly restricted ministry, preparing the way for his ministry among the nations through his disciples. This ministry is possible because of his death (Mt. 26:28, Lk. 22:20, 1 Cor. 11:25, cf. chapter eight below). The message goes out for all the people of the world (Mk. 16:15, Mt. 28:19, Acts 1:8).⁴¹

Ephesians is saying this oneness should be reflected in the church.⁴²

5.1.3 Theological enmity.

The cause of the enmity is explained in 2:14-17 as being the result of the separating influence of the Mosaic economy. This tension is not merely Jewish fanaticism, for separation had its place in the divine economy. God intended this separation between Jew and Gentile. It was pedagogic, but now Christ has come and removed it and brought blessings that could not have been otherwise.⁴³ Christ has removed the barrier so love must be stressed.⁴⁴ Unity is, and must be seen in the church, like that of husband and bride. It is what God intends for his people (Eph. 1:5-7).

This suggests a theological enmity is in mind rather than a political or a social one. But since Judaism was a church as much as a nation⁴⁵ the different kinds of enmities cannot be separated. A further trace of this division might be "every name that is named" referring to Jew and Gentile. But this is more likely to be a reference to angelic or demonic beings that reside in the heavens⁴⁶ or deities who are invoked (Acts 19:13). Col. 1:4 shows the same unity "love to all the saints" (Jew and Gentile), cf. "neither Greek nor Jew" (3:11).

Paul and his school realised that barriers existed but tried to break them down (1 Cor. 9:20-22). He believed all Christians were one in Christ Jesus.

Opponents of Paul would say that he was recreating barriers and dividing himself from his own nation along different frontiers and making them higher and more impenetrable. This was not his intention. He would blame Jewish folly and blindness. The Jews had stumbled at the stumbling stone.⁴⁷ The Jewish Messiah was Jesus Christ, who had an even greater role as the Saviour of all men. The context of Ephesians does not suggest there was a problem in the church or churches addressed even if there was elsewhere and in the world outside, Ephesians, is more of a theological meditation showing what Christ has done.⁴⁸

5.2 Ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ

We have already dismissed the possibility that the enmity actually lies in the flesh of Christ (5.1 and note 200 of chapter four), which if it were possible, would perhaps still require a $\hat{\eta}$ before Ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ . It is not likely either to be hostility in his flesh, referring to his kinsman (as Rom. 11:14). This interpretation is possible but not suitable here,⁴⁹ since the passage appears to be referring to the literal flesh of Christ. S.H. Turner rightly criticises such a view.⁵⁰ It is not simply "flesh" for this is to omit the article.⁵¹ The $\alphaὐτοῦ$ makes it clear it is the flesh of Christ, rather than in the Pauline sense of contrast to the spirit.

Paul regards flesh as weakened by sin and can only go as far as to say that Christ comes in the likeness of sinful flesh (Rom. 8:3). I Tim. 3:16 (usually regarded as post-Pauline) has the more positive use of the word,⁵² but Eph. 2:3 is nearer to the normal Pauline meaning of flesh.⁵³ In Eph. 2:14-17 we have Pauline terminology, "flesh, law, commandments, reconcile, cross, but flesh is used differently."⁵⁴

The Pauline usage is fairly broad. It is used for the earthly sphere in Rom. 11:14. In the phrase "flesh and blood", σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα means to live on earth in the body as a man. He can use the term for ordinary human flesh (1 Cor. 15:39, 2 Cor. 12:7, Gal. 4:13). In Ephesians it is likewise the physical part of man and does not offer an evaluation of man as a whole.⁵⁵ It belongs to the earthly man in sin (2:3) and weakness (6:12, 2:15, 5:29). It is a neutral term without any negative overtones. It is Johannine rather than Pauline (cf. Jn. 1:14).⁵⁶ The writer of the fourth Gospel as in the Johannine epistles may be opposing Cerinthus and Doceticism. If Ephesians is post-Pauline and linked with the Ephesus region, the writer may also find it advisable to stress the real humanity of Jesus in an area where Cerinthus was active.⁵⁷

The passage must refer to something Christ does in his flesh in relation to the hostility (whether linked with the verb λύσας or the verb καταργήσας). Having established that it is the flesh of Christ, we must decide whether this is a reference to his earthly life or to his death, or the body of Christ in the mystical sense of Jew and Gentile. The last is possible because of the way in which the writer uses subsequently the terms "body" and "new man" (2:15, 16) and "flesh" in ch. 5:29, 31.

- a) A reference to Christ's incarnation has been suggested,⁵⁸ but this would only be likely if there was a previous draft of 2:14-17 which had no reference to the word cross. It is conceivable that like Gal. 4:4 it could refer to Christ becoming man and in this passage provide the sequence of birth (15) and death (16). But "blood" has already been mentioned and 1:7 shows that the writer understands salvation as depending upon the death of Christ.

- b) It could be his earthly life, or his humanity (parallel to "he himself"),⁵⁹ the place where Christ has acted to end the hostility. But the same objections can be made as were raised in the previous suggestion.
- c) A third possibility is a reference to the Eucharist. This would be in the mind of a sacramental Christian, but is unlikely to be in the forefront of the thought of Ephesians, since the writer scarcely refers to the Eucharist.⁶⁰ Only John can be said with any likely possibility to use flesh in this connection (John 6:53ff).
- d) The mystical interpretation of body meaning the church must be rejected, since that body is the result of the work in Christ's flesh, not the means whereby it is achieved.
- e) It is thus in all probability a reference to Christ's death. This is supported by the words "blood" (v. 13) and "cross" (v. 16) and by the connections with Col. 1:22 and 2:14.⁶¹ Jesus when in the flesh was a Jew, he was under the law (Gal. 4:4), David's son, sent to the lost sheep of the house of Israel (Mt. 10:5f, 15:24). As long as he was in the flesh, the law had validity for him, but this validity ceased for him with his death (Rom. 7:4, 10:4, Gal. 2:19, 20).⁶²

Why does the author use "flesh" and not "death"? It is not just a question of wishing to have variation in the language, since he has not yet used the word, nor will he do so in the rest of the passage (cf. blood 13 and cross 16). Reasons for the use of the term "flesh" could be:-

- a) To show that Christ does not die as a private individual but in a real inclusive sense. He dies "in our nature with all its weaknesses".⁶³ Flesh may be connected with "one body" in 2:16 and the idea of one flesh in 5:31. Flesh thus shows the link with those whom he redeemed,⁶⁴ like Eve produced from the same flesh. But this is to imagine the author had ch. 5 in mind when writing ch. 2. It fails to see that flesh is essentially a reference to his death.

b)/

- b) He wants a word which speaks of Christ's physical body, given in death, that will link with the subsequent words, cross and blood. The word "body" in view of 2:16 is not sufficient for it would imply Jew and Gentile.
- c) A parallel term to body. But flesh refers to Christ alone. Body in 2:16, if it is Christ's body, also includes Jew and Gentile.
- d) To stress it was a human life which was given in death. The author might wish to do this, irrespective of whether there was a danger of Doceticism. Christ actually shed his blood. The context suggests that flesh refers to Christ's body given in death, which was the instrument in bringing unity.

5.3 Τὸν νόμον τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐν δόγμασι

Here there are three words which have some link together. They must therefore be discussed not only separately but also collectively. This will enable us to see whether each word has something to say in particular, which may or may not qualify the others in some way, or whether they are merely repetitive for emphasis. Ephesians' pleonastic use of words has been noticed frequently.⁶⁵ We compare the various words for law in Ps. 119, e.g. $\eta\gamma\iota\alpha$ = law, $\eta\iota\tau\chi$ = testimonies, $\sigma\tau\alpha\tau\upsilon\tau\alpha$ = precepts, (LXX $\epsilon\upsilon\tau\omicron\lambda\alpha\iota\varsigma$) $\sigma\tau\alpha\tau\upsilon\tau\alpha$ = statutes, $\eta\iota\chi\chi$ = commandments, $\sigma\upsilon\psi\chi$ = ordinances, $\gamma\omega\gamma$ = word, $\eta\gamma\chi\chi$ = praise.⁶⁶ Ps. 119 has no equivalent word for $\delta\omicron\gamma\mu\alpha$. It might be deemed too negative in a Psalm which praises the law. But Ephesians requires a more negative word. The meaning of the terms in the Old Testament is different from what it is in Ephesians, yet the number of words in Ps. 119 is primarily for variety and to stress the law in all its aspects. Likewise Ephesians employs a large and ornate expression, accumulating more or less synonymous substantives in his customary manner.

5.3.1 Τὸν νόμον

This is the only use of the word in Ephesians and it is used in connection with a divisive force among men. It is linked with a strong negative word $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\rho\eta\sigma\alpha\varsigma$ (see section 5.6). This divisive/

divisive aspect is often claimed to be different from Paul.⁶⁷ But Paul does imply this in Rom. 3:2 and 9:1-5 which show how the Jews were different from others through the privilege of possessing the law. Similar to Ephesians is the thought that the law closed the door of grace to Jews as well as others (Rom. 2:17-20, 9:30-33, Phil. 3:9, Eph. 2:8) and that Christ has opened to all (Rom. 1:16, 10:11-13, 16:26).

Paul uses the word *vópos* only in four letters, Romans, Galatians, 1 Corinthians and Philipians (also in Timothy and Titus). He uses it normally of the Mosaic law, which prior to his conversion he assiduously observed. But the word for him does have a number of considerably divergent meanings.⁶⁸ M. Grant suggests he is helped here by the LXX use of the word, which means he need not always use it in the revelatory sense of the Jewish Torah.⁶⁹ He can use it as something tyrannical (e.g. as Galatians) which needs to be removed. We reserve discussion of this aspect until section 5.6, when we will need to reach a conclusion on whether the Pauline view of the law is essentially different from Ephesians. Paul after his conversion accepted that the law was still applicable to Jewish believers (Rom. 2:25, 3:1ff, 31, 7:12, 1 Cor. 7:18). He also insisted that he belonged to this Jewish heritage (1 Cor. 9:20, 2 Cor. 11:22ff). He, however, protested when people insisted that Gentiles must observe it. At times he might appear inconsistent, shaving his head (Acts 18:18), circumcising Timothy (Acts 16:3), and perhaps Titus (Gal. 2:5). But he insists he is free to do so or not.⁷⁰ His conversion would affect his attitude to the law. While still believing the word of God was revealed in the divine oracles, he would find that his call to preach the gospel to the Gentiles would be a powerful factor in the dethronement of law in his own mind.⁷¹ The law had led him to the sin of sins, persecuting the church. Moreover he finds that Gentiles are being saved apart from the law and Jews are hindered from being saved by the law. Salvation he now sees as no longer depending on the law but on Christ. We are not captives to the law, but have the new life of the spirit (Rom. 7:6), being set free by the law of the Spirit (Rom. 8:2) or of Christ (Gal. 6:2).⁷² Galatians also speaks of the law as inadequate to save and thereby bringing tyranny and bondage, from which Christ sets us free (5:1).⁷³

The law as a moral standard remained and was established by the Gospel (Rom. 3:31). Christians should not sin that grace might abound (Rom. 6:15). The law made sin appear in its true light and made men realise they were sinners (7:9) even stimulating sin (7:5).

Ephesians, like Paul in Romans, believes the law is given by God himself. The law is good and authorised by God as one of the great kindnesses to the Jewish people and a wall of protection. But the sinister strength of sin had a poisoning and degrading influence. The same law, the wall of protection is converted into a wall of separation. The law impeded the Jews to extend the hand to the Gentile and shut up the door to the pagan who wished access to the covenant and promise of God.⁷⁴ We have noticed in the previous sections that the law isolated the Jews from the nations not only in the realm of religion, but also in political, social and hygienic areas. There could be no taking part in public games and exhibitions and no serving in the army.⁷⁵

The law is not something second-rate given by angels (as Gal. 3:19 or Heb. 2:2 might imply).⁷⁶ A. Ritschl saw a different understanding of the Mosaic law in Galatians from Colossians on the one hand and Romans on the other, and that these two incompatible uses stem from the personal experience of Paul.⁷⁷ Sieffert explained the difference as having no incongruity since Galatians deals with the ceremonial and Romans with the moral side. There was also development of thought.⁷⁸ It has been suggested that in Galatians the law given by angels, which provokes transgression and enslaves, is like the trial of Job, which God can use despite its origin in demonic angelic powers.⁷⁹

It has also been alleged that Paul's understanding of the Jewish way of salvation is different, that to the Jew it was really not by works, but on the contrary it was by grace. Only by excessive and consistent sin could one put himself outside the covenant. It was not a case of weighing merit.⁸⁰

If Ephesians is by Paul and Paul is consistent, he is not speaking of the abrogation of the law but of some aspect of it. We therefore discuss whether the writer is referring to the law in general, the Jewish law or its ceremonial aspect.⁸¹

Paul is usually explicit, if he means law in a general sense.⁸² It cannot be the general law here since that kind of law would not divide Jew and Gentile.⁸³ It must therefore be the Jewish law that is in mind unless the general word for law is qualified by the two words that follow.⁸⁴ This seems unlikely, for if the law were moving from a general reference to law to a Jewish one, the writer would be more specific. When Paul uses the word law other than for the Mosaic, it is clear from the context, e.g. Rom. 2:14-15, 3:27, 7:22, 3, 8:2, 9:31, Gal. 6:2. The reference is to the Jewish law, which is the law of God. The subsequent two words qualify by showing the aspects which caused separation from Gentiles.⁸⁵

5.4 τῶν ἐντολῶν

The early church which lived in a different culture from ours would not be so expert as we are in dividing the law neatly into moral and ritual aspects, but they would rather emphasize aspects of it.⁸⁶ The aspect of law which caused the barrier was "the commandments consisting in decrees",⁸⁷ which made Israel separate, rather than the aspect of incentive to upright living and holiness, which Gentiles without the law would be expected to observe.

The singular word is used in 6:2 for one of the commandments. The plural here is simply definitive or explicative to let readers know it is the Mosaic and a specific law that is in mind, rather than some general law of the universe. It shows the aspect demanding separation, which revealed a difference between Jew and Gentile. Δόγμασιν emphasizes this aspect still further.⁸⁸ A similar phrase in Heb. 7:16 is used of Melchizedek, who came not according to a legal requirement (νόμον ἐντολῆς) concerning bodily descent, but by the power of an indestructible life. This refers to the Jewish regulations which insisted that the High Priest must be from the line of Aaron. This suggests that in Ephesians the plural word is referring to and stressing the large number of the regulations of the Jewish law which disqualified others. "The law's many rules and regulations were intended to keep the Jewish nation separate and its belief in the one God safe, until God could make himself more widely known. Jesus Christ is the point of union where human beings can become a single new humanity."⁸⁹ It was these aspects, rather than general principles as/

as exemplified in the Decalogue, which marked out the Jew.

5.4.1 The significance of the genitive.

The genitive followed by ἐν is typical of Ephesians and is found in 1:17, 2:7, 22 and 3:4 linking two similar words in each case. In 2:15 we have three concepts of similar meaning.

The restrictive sense is unlikely; "he has abolished the law (that is only) the commandments". A noun in apposition (in the accusative) would have been more appropriate for this.

In non-Pauline literature, the genitives⁹⁰ seem either to strengthen by repetition or to enlarge upon the content. Many would reflect the genitive of quality, which is the semitic equivalent of an adjective, e.g. there are several instances in Hebrews "word of power", "sufferings of death", "deceit of sin", "word of hearing", "law of commandment", "word of exhortation", cf. "the world of unrighteousness" (James 3:6) and "the word of truth" (2 Tim. 2:15).⁹¹

Ephesians 2:15 is thus referring to the kind of law which deals with commands. It is thus akin to the idea of content "the law of commandments consisting in decrees".⁹²

Repetition is suggested by the single article for the words.⁹³ The law is one. It is made up of commandments and these expressed themselves and operated in the form of dogmata (so Salmond).

5.5 Ἐν δόγματι

The author must have reason for accompanying ἐντολῶν with these words (unless p46 is correct in omitting). Why then does he use them?

We think at once of Col. 2:14, the only other New Testament use of δόγμα in this sense, and we are in danger of interpreting unconsciously in the same way. Whereas here it is definitely related to the law, in Colossians it is the work of evil spirits,⁹⁴ the submitting to the yoke of arbitrary human ordinances. The plural in these two instances is like the plural word "works" in Gal. 5 in contrast to the singular "fruit".

In classical Greek, *δύγχα* means an opinion or resolution and is used in the plural of philosophical tenets.⁹⁵ It also means a decree, which is the only meaning in the New Testament. The word is found in Luke 2:1, Acts 16:4, 17:7 (cf. Dan. 2:13 and 6:13). It is used of public decrees, of the edicts of princes and also of the decrees of the apostles concerning things strangled and the partaking of blood (Acts 16:4). It was for such things as these that the Jews were considered a strange race.⁹⁶

Whereas elsewhere in the New Testament the context makes it plain it does not refer to the law, the context here makes it plain that there is a connection. It appears to refer to an aspect of the law, like food laws, clean and unclean things.⁹⁷

The preposition *ἐν* suggests an aspect of the law and is probably descriptive.⁹⁸ It is referring to the law as understood in a certain way "expressed in statutes".⁹⁹

Modern exegesis follows Abelard in seeing it as a further definition of the law and not the means of abrogation, as it was understood in the early church. A comma was placed before "in decrees".¹⁰⁰ This gave *ἐν δόγμασι* an instrumental meaning entirely separate from the law of commandments. The law of Moses is the cause of the hostility and Christ has removed this "by decrees".¹⁰¹ The decrees in this case are statutes given by Christ to supersede the Old Testament laws and commandments.¹⁰² Christ annuls by decrees the law of commandments. Support for this interpretation was found in the fact that *δόγματα* is never used elsewhere in the New Testament for the Mosaic commandments.¹⁰³ Grammar appears also to be an ally of this suggestion, since there is no article making it more likely to be linked grammatically with *καταργήσας* and for *ἐν* to be instrumental. However *ἐν* in 6:4 does not denote the instrument and when three words are found together the article does not need to be repeated.

Avoiding the difficulty of grammar only gives us a deeper problem, the teaching of a new law which annulled the old. Ephesians might teach this since it does not refer to the law elsewhere. However there is an explicit reference to the fifth commandment in 6:2. Such teaching would be contrary to Paul who regards the old law as remaining just and good.¹⁰⁴ It is possible that Mt. 5:21 etc. and John 1:17, 13:34 teach a new law.¹⁰⁵ But here it would

give an incongruity. Christ abolished the law not by his death, but by his doctrine. In any case, *δόγμα* never means doctrine elsewhere in the New Testament.¹⁰⁶

Δόγμα seems to qualify law in a negative aspect. The aspects which Christ must remove are the divisive aspects, such as the ceremonial, which made Gentiles inferior. The law is no longer a power overlording the Gentiles.

There are other places in the New Testament where there is no article and where words are connected and form one idea.¹⁰⁷ The three words belong together. The law consists of commandments and the definitive form in which these were expressed is authoritative decrees.¹⁰⁸

5.6 Καταργήσας

The participle and its clause depend grammatically on the main clause "for he is our peace" (as the two previous participial clauses *ποιήσας* and *λύσας*). We have to ask whether these clauses are exactly parallel, or whether they are a kind of step parallelism where each clause develops the previous one a little further.¹⁰⁹

They are parallel in the sense that each in a different way explains how Christ is our peace, (a) by making them one, (b) by breaking down the barrier, and (c) by annulling the decrees. It is also clear, however, that (b) and (c) in turn elucidate the clauses that respectively precede them.¹¹⁰ Jew and Gentile are one because the barrier is broken down and the barrier is broken down because the decrees are annulled. Coming last of the three, the third clause is the ultimate explanation of why and in what manner Christ is the peace between Jew and Gentile. By abrogating the law, Christ has suppressed the foundation of the enmity and has depressed to its foundation the barrier between Jew and Gentile. The enmity and the dividing barrier were no more than consequences or external manifestations of the other more profound cause, the law.

We note in passing the variant reading *καταρτίσας* which comes from either a corrector or a scribal error.

The verb *καταργέω* in secular Greek means to leave unemployed or idle.¹¹¹ In some of the papyri it has the meaning of "bringing to a standstill", "putting out of gear".¹¹² In the New Testament it means to abrogate or annul, to make useless or void.¹¹³ It is found four times in the LXX for the Aramaic *פָּקַד* to make to cease, to restrain (2 Esdras 4:21, 23, 5:5, 6:8).¹¹⁴

The thought seems typically Pauline¹¹⁵ and is akin to Rom. 7:4 (dead to the law), 10:4 (Christ the end of the law), Gal. 2:19 (through the law, dead to the law). But in none of these examples is the verb *καταργέω* used.

The word, however, is very frequent in Paul. It is used in the absolute sense of destruction in 2 Thess. 2:8 (the lawless one), 1 Cor. 2:6 (rulers of this age), 15:24 and 26 (all rule and authority and power, death), 6:13 (food and body), Rom. 6:6 (sinful body). It has the sense of bringing to an end in 1 Cor. 13:8, 10 (tongues, childish ways), Gal. 5:11 (stumbling block of the cross). There is the more gradual sense of fading in 2 Cor. 3:7, 11, 13f.

Romans 7:6 is apparently close to Ephesians when it says we are delivered from the law, dead to that which held us captive, but Rom. 3:31 appears to say the opposite ("do we then overthrow the law by this faith? No: we establish it.").¹¹⁶ So there is either a contradiction or a different law in mind or a slight difference in the meaning of the word. Ephesians is saying that the divisive aspect is removed, but not the law as such. Rom. 7:6 means (like Galatians 3:10-14) that the law can no longer sentence us to death for breaking it and conversely we are freed from fulfilling its demands in order to obtain life. The writer has in mind principally what effect the law had on "the far".¹¹⁷

Knowing the writer's fondness for piling phrase upon phrase, the verb may not be very significant, but simply a variant of *λύσας* and *ἀποκτείνας* (16). He does not use *ἀθετέω* (Mk. 6:26, Lk. 7:30, 10:16, John 12:48, 1 Cor. 1:19, Gal. 2:21, 1 Thess. 4:8, Jude 8) which means "set at naught" (cf. *καταφρονεῖν* in 2 Pet. 2:10) nor *ἐξουθενεῖν* "reject with contempt", which is a stronger word with overtones (2 Cor. 10:10, Mk. 9:12 v.l.).

We now summarise six possible emphases that the word has in mind.

a) Removes the law completely.

Abbott thinks this is so, even though some aspects are found in the law of Christ. He gives the example of a Moslem leaving his faith, but still not killing or stealing, etc. This does not mean that part of the Qumran is still valid for him, only that Islam has some parallels with Christianity. This view contradicts Pauline teaching and Eph. 6:2.

b) Making powerless.

We have seen that this has linguistic support. It could mean taking away the terror of the law and its power to separate and divide.

c) Revealing its inadequacy.

It cannot save men and therefore loses its grip on men.¹¹⁸

d) Fulfilling.

The law is not destroyed, since it was ordained by God but fulfilled by Christ and brought to completion and fruition. This is taught in Mt. 5:17 where the verb is πληρῶν (contrasted with καταλύν not καταργέω). It is only through combining the two ideas of abolition and fulfilment that Zerwick can say "God found a way to abolish the law by causing his son to fulfil it once and for all."¹¹⁹ Ephesians is nearer to Gal. 3:13, where Christ's death is the means of the Gentiles' deliverance from the curse of the law.

e) Removing the burden of the law.¹²⁰

We say burden rather than yoke, because not all Jews would regard the yoke as a bad thing.¹²¹

This means that the law is still a reality, but not a power acting against the Gentile believer. He has died to it (Rom. 6:7).¹²²

But this is to understand the law as the barrier between men and God, whereas the thought here is primarily of a barrier between Jew and Gentile. The punctuation of the passage (see section 5.7) also bears upon this fact whether the law is a barrier itself, or the unwitting cause of the hostility, which is the barrier.¹²³

f) Removing the barrier, which the law caused to be erected. The context suggests a connection of law with the barrier between Jew and Gentile.¹²⁴ It is true that the Jews regarded the law as having universal significance, binding on all and having been preached to all in the languages of the seventy nations.¹²⁵ The Noachian laws were so regarded (Acts 15:29).¹²⁶ Philo says "The laws of Moses are incorruptible" and of worldwide purpose. "He appointed the contemplative race in the same manner as the law for the world For the chosen race is a likeness of the world and its law is a likeness of the laws of the world".¹²⁷

Yet despite this seeming generosity, they would say it was their law which was God's law and to be able to keep it properly one must become a Jew. "The Mosaic law was the source of all the superiority and uniqueness upon which the Jew prided himself in relation to the Gentile ... stigmatizing the Gentiles as unclean".¹²⁸

It is the divisive effect of the law that has been abolished. The law in the sense of the will of God to do what is right remains as the Haustafeln show. But it is no longer divisive, for the Gentiles are now fellow-heirs and in the same body. Both are saved not through the law, but through Christ. The barrier which the law caused to be erected has been removed.

5.7 How much is dependent upon λύσας and how much upon καταργήσας?

This question means that we must now discuss the various possible ways of punctuation and notice the advantages and disadvantages of the various possibilities.

5.7.1 View one.

Place a comma after ἔκθραν and not after λύσας and thus relate ἔκθραν to λύσας thus making ἔκθραν in apposition to the middle wall. "He has broken down the dividing wall, the hostility, by his flesh annulling the law with its rules and regulations".¹²⁹

Firstly,/

Firstly, this view has support¹³⁰ and there are existing parallels to the use of *λύω* with *ἔχθρα*. The argument from neatness of the construction cannot be decisive since from the angle of grammatical neatness the next suggestion is better.

Secondly, this gives different purposes to the successive clauses. The first clause expresses that the reconciliation has been effected, "he made the two one, having removed the wall or enmity between them." The mode is then expressed in the second clause, "annulling the law of commandments in decrees".

Thirdly, the position of the words favours taking *ἔχθραν* with *λύσας*.

Fourthly, the middle wall of partition needs an explanation and this is supplied by the word hostility. The phrase "in his flesh" tells how Christ has broken down the barrier.

This punctuation, therefore, has much in its favour and it can also be translated, "For he is our peace, because he made both one and destroyed the middle wall, namely the hostility".

However, there are some objections:

- 1) It appears to make the *καὶ* before "middle wall" rather clumsy.
- 2) It implies that *καταργήσας* is closely linked to law, rather than to enmity, for the next clause now reads, "he has annulled in his flesh, the law" rather than "he has annulled the enmity in his flesh, namely the law".
- 3) It spoils the symmetry of "removing the middle wall" "destroying the hostility". Parallels to *ἔχθρα* as the object of *καταργέω* are virtually unknown.¹³¹

5.7.1.1 View one A.

Treat all words after *ἔχθραν* in 15 as far as its recurrence in v. 16 as a parenthesis. The main support for this possibility comes from the habit of Eph., e.g. 2:1 and 3:1, to have apparent digression.¹³² Order is certainly against this suggestion and *ἔχθραν* becomes isolated.

5.7.1.2/

5.7.1.2 View one B.

Excise "hostility". This is an even more desperate expedient.

5.7.2 View two.

Place a comma after λύσας and no comma after ἔχθραν . He has broken down the dividing wall, having abolished the enmity in his flesh (i.e. the law of commandments contained in ordinances). This receives support from v.16, which speaks of Christ killing the enmity ἐν αὐτῇ which can mean "by it" (that is the cross).¹³³ But if this is what the author intended, he would probably have had the word order "having abolished in his flesh the enmity".

But with this punctuation we can also translate like the KJV, "hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances." This gives a very tidy construction of two participial phrases separated by "and", with participles at the ends of each.¹³⁴ In Ephesians, participles are at the end of clauses in 1:23 and 4:28 although they are more often in the middle (1:1, 12, 1:16) and more frequent still at the beginning (1:5, 8, 11).

Objections to this punctuation are:-

- 1) It means that λύσας belongs entirely to what precedes and καταργήσας has two objects dependent upon it (enmity which is expressed in law). The law is thus related directly to enmity rather than being simply the cause of it.¹³⁵ It is true that the law's hostility is implied in the qualifying words "consisting in rules and commandments" and one can argue that according to Paul it is always the law which is the cause of the enmity between Gentile and Jew, because it set Israel on a pedestal.¹³⁶
- 2) Enmity is better in apposition to middle wall than it is to the law itself. The first two words are particularly negative. It is as we have seen rather strong to say that the law is the enmity. It is easier to say as in view one that /

that the law is indirectly the cause of the enmity. *Τὸν νόμον* *καταργήσας* is a subordinate clause (with or without *ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ*) showing how he destroyed the enmity by abolishing the law.

- 3) *τὴν ἔχθραν* is now at the beginning of the clause. But it could have this position for emphasis.

A difficult alternative is to throw the weight of the sentence on *καταργήσας* . "He made the two systems one and destroyed the middle wall by abolishing the hostility".

5.7.2.1 View two A.

Ἐν δόγμασι and *ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ* can be seen as parallels dependent upon *καταργήσας* . "Christ abolished by his death the enmity. He abolished the law of commandments by spreading over the whole world the ordinances of the gospel". This was favoured by Bengel, but is not in favour today. The form of the construction is acceptable, but it means that *ἐν δόγμασιν* has to be separated from "the law of commandments" which now belongs to "in his flesh". Bengel felt it must be so, because the expression "in his flesh" would have been placed after rather than before, if it belonged to "the law of commandments". Bengel sees the style of a lapidary (that is an arrangement so that alternate pieces of stone match), e.g.

<i>τὴν ἔχθραν</i>	<i>ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ</i>
<i>τὸν νόμον τῶν ἐντολῶν</i>	<i>ἐν δόγμασι</i>
<i>καταργήσας</i>	

But this is not perfect symmetry, since the genitives and the longer units are not in the corresponding phrases.

To understand *ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ* with *τὴν ἔχθραν* may be quite grammatical, but we have seen it is very difficult from a theological point of view to see a hostility in the flesh of Christ (Section 5.1).

5.7.3 View three.

Place a comma after *ἐντολῶν* and relate all the previous words to *λύσας* . *Ἐν δόγμασι* can be taken with *καταργήσας* alone. This means that *δόγμασι* are the decrees of the gospel, which/

which we have found to be an unacceptable interpretation, despite the fact that it was widely held in the early church.

5.7.4 View four.

This is similar to the first view, except the comma is placed after "in his flesh" giving a neat translation from the natural order of the words. "He has broken down the dividing wall, the hostility in his flesh. He has annulled the law with its rules and regulations."¹³⁷ This connects both "hostility" and "in his flesh" with λύσας.¹³⁸

- a) This provides a good parallel with two similar clauses, although one clause has the verb (λύσας) in the middle and the other the verb (καταργήσας) at the end.
- b) It also has the two objects of the verbs both followed by ἐν "removing the hostility in his flesh, destroying the law of commandments in ordinances".¹³⁹
- c) It links hostility with the wall and not directly with the law.
- c) "In his flesh" goes more naturally with λύσας than with καταργήσας.¹⁴⁰ since it is easier to see how Jesus' death removed the barrier than how he destroyed the law. The former is an observable fact, the latter is a theological interpretation.

This punctuation is therefore preferred.

5.8 Summary of 2:14c-15a.

Accepting the final suggestion, but without dogmatically dismissing the others as impossible, we find that the writer says "For he is our peace, who made two entities one and broke down in his flesh the dividing wall the hostility, annulling the law of commandments contained in decrees".

This idea follows quite naturally from the statement that the far have become near. The distance was neither geographical (as for Jews of the Dispersion) nor spatial (as in gnosticism) but through a huge barrier resulting from one people having a special law. But now this barrier and all the enmity which it entailed have been removed by his flesh. This flesh refers to more than his incarnation (if it includes that at all) since flesh has some link with blood in v.13.

Christ has annulled the effects of the law. He has suppressed the existence of the enmity between Jew and pagan. Consequently he has knocked down the wall which divided them and converted the duality into a unity. One short sentence sums it all up, "He is our peace".¹⁴¹

If someone should think that God was showing favouritism at first, it was really his plan for the universe. He had to begin with one people, in one particular place. But the long term plan is for peace for all.

CHAPTER SIX. EPHESIANS 2.15b.

ἵνα τοὺς δύο κτίσῃ ἐν αὐτῷ εἰς ἓνα καὶνὸν ἄνθρωπον
ποιῶν εἰρήνην

So far we have ascertained that although 2:14-17 has quotation material from Isaiah and Colossians, it is not a hymn. The earlier part has stated that Christ has removed the barrier of hostility between Jew and Gentile, which came about because of the existence of the law possessed by only one group of people. The purpose of Christ's action is now explained.

In 15bc and 16 we have two parallel statements:-

That he might create the two into one new man in him, making peace.
 That he might reconcile both to God in one body, killing the enmity in him (or by it).¹

We have noticed how Schille (Section 3.2.5.2) saw this as the second double line of a hymn, developing the thought of peace which was one of the three keywords (he, peace, our) in the theme line.²

First of all, there is a final clause "in order that he might create the two into one new man" and then a participial phrase "making peace" which could represent a clause giving the result "so making peace" or be an explanation of why Christ has been called previously "our peace".³ The first clause gives the purpose and reason for the barrier's removal "to make the two one" (either in him or by him). The fact that they become one new man is either part of that purpose or the result of that purpose. We thus have a positive aspect of Christ's work after the more negative necessity of breaking down and destroying.⁴

6.1 Τοὺς δύο

These are the "two" who were divided as a result of the law; the near and the far of v.13; not Jews at home and abroad as in Isaiah, but Jew and Gentile. The "far" are referred to as "you" in v.17. We thus have the two great blocks in which Paul divides humanity. These two groups were indicated by the ἡμῶν in v.14 and also by ἀμφότερα. We do not have the neuter here, because the writer wished/

wished to personalise the entities. He therefore proceeds to describe them as "one new man".

A gnostic explanation of "both" as heaven and earth has already been rejected. In any case, heaven does not need to be formed into something new.

If we had been able to prove that a Jewish hymn lay behind this passage, the two could have been Jews and proselytes (Acts 2:10), Jews and Samaritans, Ephraim and Manasseh.⁵ If it were a Christian hymn previously, the two could be Jew and Gentile, slave and free, male and female. But this is unnecessary conjecture, since we have found the evidence for a hymn unsubstantial. It is fundamental in exegesis to understand a phrase, wherever possible from its immediate context and from the piece of literature in which it is set. Only where there are obvious difficulties and most unusual terminology and structure should we resort to other hypotheses. The context is clearly that of Jew and Gentile, for which there are many Pauline parallels.⁶

Is there any significance in the text having δύο instead of ἁρμότεια ? It can be the writer's fondness for variation or to show he moves from systems to the men who lived under them, or to stress the separateness that was characteristic of Jew and Gentile.⁷ "Two" is a much more divisive word than "both". Two can emphasize distinctiveness, whereas both suggests something in common together.

The new man is made up of distinctive entities, Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians. "The composition of the new man out of the two safeguards the rights of Christians to be different one from another", and to remember their distinct histories.⁸

The word "two" like "both" stands alone with no accompanying noun.⁹ Ephesians 5:31 has this concept of two becoming one in reference to husband and wife, but there it is two individuals whereas here two groups of individuals are in mind. We are also reminded of The Gospel of Thomas 22 where the disciples asked when they would be in the kingdom. Jesus replies "when the two are one" referring to the union of man with God and of woman with man.

6.2 ΚΤΙΣΗ

The verb *ποιέω* is not used but *κτίσω* which has the emphasis on something made that is essentially different.¹⁰ The creation is therefore subsequently called a new man, not another earthly nationality.¹¹ Another reason for using *κτίσω* instead of *ποιέω* is possibly to provide a contrast with the first creation of the old man Adam. Here a new man is created in Christ, the last Adam. We will therefore have to continue this investigation when we discuss the phrase "new man" (cf. 1 Cor. 15:45).

There is a possible connection with 2:10, where the noun *ποίημα* (based on the same root as the verb *ποιέω*) precedes the verb to create.

The verb implies a new creation¹² and recalls Col. 1:16.¹³ The thought is found again in Eph. 4:24 in connection with the creation of the individual new man (cf. Col. 3:10).¹⁴

In the New Testament *κτίσω* usually has God as subject. Here it is Christ, who proceeds to reconcile in one body to God.¹⁵ Since throughout 14-18 Christ is the subject, he must be the subject of this verb. It is one reason why "he is our peace".

The concept of a new creation is common in Paul, not only in a cosmic, eschatological sense of a new order (cf. Is. 40-55) but of the individual Christian (2 Cor. 5:17, cf. Gal. 6:15)¹⁶ not under law but under grace (Rom. 6:14).

To the Rabbis a proselyte was one who had been created anew. "He who brings a Gentile near is as though he created him".¹⁷ Such a concept was known in pre-Christian hellenistic Judaism (Joseph and Asenath 15).¹⁸ Asenath is told, upon becoming a proselyte, "You will be renewed and recreated and will receive a new life."

6.3 Ἐν αὐτῷ

Ἐν gives a variety of meaning to the words it governs like its approximate equivalent in English. *Ἐν* is "the maid of all work"¹⁹ being the equivalent of the simple dative or having an instrumental use. It is found seventeen times in Eph. 1:1-14. Here it is linked with a word which can be translated as "it", "him" or "himself". Assuming/

Assuming for the moment that $\acute{\epsilon}\alpha\upsilon\tau\hat{\omega}$ was not the original reading and was a wrong interpretation of later copyists for an original $\alpha\upsilon\tau\hat{\omega}$, it could have been neuter. It would then refer to blood or even the feminine word flesh in vv. 13 and 14,²⁰ to the act of breaking the wall or annulling the law. $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\hat{\omega}$ occurs again in the next verse and might refer there to the antecedent "cross". We shall see, however, that $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\alpha\upsilon\tau\hat{\omega}$ in v. 16 more likely refers to Christ. Furthermore, an instrumental use in verse 15 is not clear. The instrument is not stated, yet in the next verse it is (the cross). Normally an instrument is specified in the first reference and then in subsequent verses referred to by a pronoun. Flesh and blood (v.13) are by no means obvious as antecedents of $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\hat{\omega}$, but law or enmity could claim to be.

Certainly difficulties of the reflexive $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\alpha\upsilon\tau\hat{\omega}$, like "Christ creates himself to be the new man" or "out of himself Christ brings forth a partner" are avoided as well as the fact that the antecedent Christ is only found in the third person form of the verb ($\kappa\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma\eta$ without an $\alpha\upsilon\tau\hat{\omega}\varsigma$). Nevertheless "in it" will only be acceptable if we find that the meaning "in him, in himself" is more unlikely.

"In himself" is possible, since we have the reading $\acute{\epsilon}\alpha\upsilon\tau\hat{\omega}$ in X³ DGKLpm and most miniscules, pal, syr, Marc, Eus, Ephiphanius, Ath² Chr, Cyr² Thd. p46XABFP + 10 min have $\alpha\upsilon\tau\hat{\omega}$ which Tregelles, Tischendorf and Lachmann read $\alpha\upsilon\tau\hat{\omega}$ and Westcott and Hort $\alpha\upsilon\tau\hat{\omega}$. It is not easy to decide which we should accept and internal evidence must decide. "He in him" does not sound correct, so "he in himself" is to be preferred. The following possible translations are possible:

- a) It can be descriptive, "by means of himself" or instrumental "by himself" which really are the same. $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ is used of the instrument in Lk. 22:49 and of persons as agents (Acts 11:16, Mt. 9:34) although one would prefer $\delta\iota\acute{\alpha}$ (as v. 18). The writer may be mindful of the fact that he later has $\delta\iota\acute{\alpha}\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \sigma\tau\alphaυ\rho\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ and may wish for variation.
- b) The sense could be that men are in Christ because they are united in him and form one new person with him, "one new man in himself" (Gal. 3:28, cf. John 10:16).²¹ It is possibly akin to the Pauline phrase "in Christ". This would be more likely if we were certain that Ephesians had the same use and understanding/

understanding of this phrase, but even then it is unlikely, since Christ is the subject²² in our present phrase.

- c) Despite the difficulties previously mentioned, it might be that Christ forms himself into the new man. Through his obedience he becomes the contrast to the first Adam. Christ from himself brings forth a new partner like Eve is brought from Adam.²³ Christ is the second Adam. "He is really the second man in whom the human race is made a harmonious unity and all things are to be summed up as their head".²⁴
- d) Christians are formed in him and become part of him in the sense of Jewish corporeality, just as they form one body.²⁵ However it is not said that the body is Christ's but that this body is formed of Jew and Gentile.

Of these four views, we prefer the instrumental sense (a), which is much more straightforward.

6.3.1 The phrase "in Christ" and its use in Ephesians.

The instrumental use of $\epsilon\upsilon\chi\alpha\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\omega}$ in this passage and the link with Christ as well as $\epsilon\upsilon\chi\alpha\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\omega}$ in 2:6 leads us to examine the phrase "in Christ" which is found frequently in the Pauline Corpus. Gnllka thinks that in Eph. 2:15, 16 there occurs a reflexive meaning of "in Christ" which has no parallel in other writings. Each passage in the Pauline literature has, therefore, to be studied on its own merits.²⁶ It is most unwise to take "in Christ" as always having the same meaning. Paul may not have a clearly fixed view in his own mind.²⁷ Contradictions or at least paradoxes are found in Gal. 2:20ff. Paul has never fathomed the depth of his Damascus experience, when he changed from persecuting Christ to belonging to him. The phrase "why do you persecute me" could be the seed in his mind of the idea of "being in Christ". He discovers he had actually been seeking to kill those who were in Christ.²⁸

The variations in the use of "in Christ" show we cannot say dogmatically with J.A. Allan²⁹ that Ephesians fails to grasp Paul's deeper meaning. The writer goes deeper than the earlier Paul. Not only is the believer in Christ subsequent to the Christ event and/

and prior to the believer's conversion. He was actually already in that position in God's plan from eternity. Ephesians also has a number of different formulations of the phrase, including three that are unique to this epistle, $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \tau\acute{\omega}\ \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\omega}\ \acute{\iota}\eta\sigma\omicron\upsilon$ (3:11) $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \tau\acute{\omega}\ \acute{\iota}\eta\sigma\omicron\upsilon$ (4:21) $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \kappa\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\omega$ (6:1, variant reading). Besides the usual $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\omega}$ we have $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \tau\acute{\omega}\ \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\omega}$ in 1:10, 12, 20, $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\omega}\ \acute{\iota}\eta\sigma\omicron\upsilon$ 3:21 and $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\omega}$ (2:15).³⁰

Has each of these a distinct meaning? The answer is No! There are different forms in 1:1 and 1:3 but both mean the same.³¹

Ephesians can also use the reverse idea. In 3:17 Christians are not in Christ, but Christ is in them (cf. Col. 1:27).

What does the phrase mean in Ephesians?³² Does it always mean the same? We suggest that it has at least three emphases, which doubtless overlap.

- a) It is local referring to position (e.g. 1:3, 4, 10; 2:6, 8, 13).
- b) It is instrumental referring to Christ as the agent (1:20 and 2:10).
- c) It refers to Christ as the object of trust (1:12, 15; 2:22). Here in 2:15 $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\omega}$ is in the category (b), "He creates by himself", which may also be the meaning of the phrase in 2:16.

6.4 "Ένα καινόν ἄνθρωπον"

An indefinite term is not deemed sufficient here. Instead of a new man, we have one new man,³³ suggesting emphasis and contrast with "both" and "two". "One" recalls verse 14 and is repeated in 18. Ephesians frequently stresses "one" (2:14, 16, 18; 4:4-6; 5:31; compare "all" in 1:15, 22; 2:3 and 3:19). It is not only the number (one instead of two) that is significant, but also the quality.³⁴ The word new is prefixed, suggesting a difference from the previous entities.

The new entity is of a higher order than the previous entities. It is not just an amalgam of the previous two groups.³⁵

It is frequently observed that $\kappa\alpha\iota\nu\acute{o}\varsigma$ is used and not $\nu\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\varsigma$.³⁶ $\nu\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\varsigma$ was often used for a temporal innovation, something new in time. A thing could be new ($\nu\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\varsigma$) but not unique. (In these days/

days of mass production there are many new things, but often ten millions of one particular article are produced.) *καὶνός* means new in the sense of youth, that which has not yet been, that which has just made its appearance. It often had a qualitative sense. It meant fresh, newly made, uninjured by decay or use. In a moral sense it meant "renewed", "pure". It was thus a new quality of a thing which did not exist before, something unique, for the first time in evidence. Abbott thinks *καὶνὸν* is necessary because the one is neither Greek nor Jew. Both have put off their former religious condition and have received the same new nature. However in late Greek the distinction diminishes. 1 Cor. 5:7 and Col.3:10 show the words can be synonymous.³⁷

If there is no real significance here in the use of *καὶνόν* rather than *νέος*, new man can refer to simply another man, a new entity replacing the old, but if *καὶνόν* is used carefully, it could be to show that we have a new race of a superior quality to that of the previous components. The idea of various things being new is frequent in the Old Testament (new heart, new spirit). When new is used with man it leads to the contrast of Adam with the new Adam, Christ.³⁸

This new man can therefore be a third type, a Christian,³⁹ Jew and Gentile being the previous two. But it could simply refer to a new collection of men in which the previous distinction can still have some relevance. In this new man an individual can still be a Jew or Gentile. It is wrong to argue, however, that the position of the Jew has not really changed and that Gentiles have joined the Jews in worshipping the father.⁴⁰ Paul would certainly insist that he was still a Jew. But in the spiritual sense, a Jew had to be changed from his unbelief in Christ, just like Gentiles needed to be. Paul himself had to be changed. Paul's concept of the new man means that one dies with Christ to the old age and rises in the new age of the Spirit, where neither Jew nor Greek is found. There is no reason to suggest that Ephesians teaches differently. Both become new and find the peace that exists only in Christ.

It is true that the writer distinguishes Gentiles and Jews in the writing of the letter, but this is because of the circumstances of history. He is writing to overcome these. Divisions exist in the/

the old order, but not in the new. The distinction is no longer between the Jew and the Gentile, but between the new order of Christians and the old order of Jew and Gentile.⁴¹ The new is really the oldest. It existed long before there were any Jews or Gentiles (1:4) and still does in the heavenly places (2:6).

We notice it is not new men but a new man. Jew and Gentile make one undivided whole.

In addition to the question of whether the new man is a third type or a different type, there is the question of whether this new man is in the final analysis a separate entity from Christ, or whether it forms with him, the new man. If *ἐν* is instrumental, as we prefer, either is possible; if it is the dative usage, it can be only the latter. We shall discuss in Section 6.4.3.4 the possibility of corporate personality, in which case if Christ is the new man and man's representative in the sense that the old Adam was, all men can be said to be in him.⁴² It then becomes a fuller term and more definite than a general reference to a "new life".⁴³

The new man appears to be the church formed from Jew and Gentile, and perhaps Jesus is to be understood as the new man who incorporates Jew and Gentile in himself, and is likewise the head of the body of v.16 (cf. 4:16 and 5:23). The new man would then not be simply the church, but the church plus Christ.

Here, however, Christ forms the new man. It is not simply Christ himself living in Jew and Gentile and forming in both the new. It is on the contrary a reference to his people the church, although the church is called a man nowhere else in the New Testament. It is the church as she will be at the climax of history. In the converted Gentile one does not see the Gentile, in the converted Jew one does not see the Jew primarily. Their apparent "irreducible duality" is "reduced to a unity which no one was able to foresee or expect".⁴⁴ I suggest therefore that Jew and Gentile form together the one new man (a new person = Harless). This is supported by the reference in the next verse to the one body; Jew and Gentile do not form a torso, they form a new man. The idea of the head is not found, in that it does belong to the metaphor, which is about the relationship of Jew and Gentile, not about Christians/

Christians and Christ. The new man is not Christ, but belongs to him. Christ himself creates the new man distinct from himself. The new man is certainly linked to him as the bride is to Christ, but that is not under discussion here. She also depends upon him for life. Nevertheless Christ has an existence apart from her. There is no reference to the idea of Christ raised as the first fruits of a new humanity. Christ is not depicted as a germinal cell and the primacy of a new humanity which God has created in him.⁴⁵

The verb *κτίσιν* suggests there is an eschatological sense as in Ignatius (Ephesians 20:1). There is thus a link with the new creation of 2 Cor. 5:17 and Gal. 6:15, as we noticed previously. The coming of something new is predicted in the Old Testament. There is a new Exodus (Is. 40ff), a new covenant (Jer. 31:31, cf. Mt. 26:28, 2 Cor. 3:6, Heb. 9:15), a new David (Ez. 34:23), a new Holy Land (Ez. 40-48), a new Jerusalem (Is. 62), a new temple (Ez. 40-43), a new heart and a new spirit (Ez. 11:19, 36:26), a new creation (Is. 40:28, 45:8, 48:6-7, 66:22), new fruit (Ez. 47:12), a new thing in the earth (Jer. 31:22, Is. 42:9), a new name (62:2). The Messianic age was understood basically as a universal renovation, not only institutionally and anthropologically, but including the cosmic (a new heaven and earth, Is. 65:17 and 66:22). The centre of this renovation will be the Messiah,⁴⁶ like Adam in the first creation. The theme of a new creation in an eschatological sense was current in Palestinian Judaism.⁴⁷ The idea of new birth is much wider, being found in John's Gospel and in the Mystery Religions.

According to the Gospels, Jesus saw his coming as bringing a new era, the kingdom of God which had been heralded by the Baptist. Jesus spoke of the new garment (Mt. 9:16) and new wine (Mt. 9:17), of new things (Mt. 13:52) and of new tongues (Mark 16:17 T R). John 13:34 speaks of a new commandment and Rev. 5:9 of a new song. Rev. 21:1 speaks of a new heaven and 21:5 of all things made new. The Ephesians eschatology is stripped of the apocalyptic garb and the new is seen as being realised through Christ. Newness is moreover a general desire of man.

6.4.1 Origin of the concept.

It is easier to say what the new man signifies in Eph. 2:15 than it is to explain why he is so called or what actually inspired the concept.⁴⁸ "New" and "man" are two common words, but a technical background does seem likely. It seems to be more than a mere metaphor illustrating God's dealing with man as a whole, as a single individual in Christ.

Ἄνθρωπος or *άνήρ* are found several times in Ephesians.⁴⁹ 3:16 speaks of the inner man, which is a reference to men individually rather than collectively, concerning their spiritual nature. 4:13 speaks of a perfect man fully grown and emphasizes that this is a unity to which we must come. Christ is the standard. There seems to be a connection between growing into the head (4:15) and of a building becoming complete (2:21) since growth is also found in the latter reference. 4:22, 24 speak of putting off the old man and putting on the new (cf. Col. 3:9, 10). In the New Testament, this antithesis is only found in the Captivity Epistles, although anticipated in Romans 6:6. In Romans it is an individual concept, so Eph. 2:15 is different for it has no mention of an old man. Yet the usage in Romans may have contributed to the thought here.⁵⁰

6.4.2 Pauline parallels to "new man".

Col. 1:28 has a similar thought, but it is of the individual made perfect in Christ. Gal. 3:28 may be translated "you are all one person in Christ".⁵¹

"One man" in Rom. 5:12, 15 clearly refers to Adam. Rom. 6:6 has already been mentioned. Rom. 7:22 refers to the inward man (cf. Eph. 3:16 and 1 Cor. 2:15).⁵² Man is created in the image of God and 2 Cor. 3:18 may reflect this idea when it says that we are "all changed into the same image". Paul clearly states that the church is formed after the image of Christ and is made to conform with him (Gal. 4:19, 2 Cor. 4:6, Phil. 3:10, 21, Rom. 8:29).

6.4.3/

6.4.3 The Old Testament background.

This is the most likely background if Ephesians is by Paul and if he derives more from Jewish thought than from Greek.⁵³

The creation of a new man is taught in Ps. 101 (102):19, Is. 45:8, 54:1-6, 44:2, 46:11. Various other Old Testament antecedents may be used directly by Ephesians or be mediated through Colossians (e.g. Abraham as the true new man).

6.4.3.1 Son of Man.

In the New Testament this appears to be a translation of an Aramaic idiom of man and so must be regarded as a possible antecedent, or be derived from the same background. The Synoptics and in a slightly different way the Fourth Gospel both agree in using it only as a self-designating title of Jesus.⁵⁴ Apart from an Old Testament citation in Hebrews, it is only found on the lips of others in Acts 7:56.⁵⁵

Paul reflects elsewhere a knowledge of material similar to the Gospels. Ephesians can be acquainted equally with such tradition, particularly if the writer belongs to the next generation to Paul, when the Gospels would be circulating. Romans 13:1-10 (and 14:10) reflects the kind of teaching found in the Sermon on the Mount and we would not necessarily confine Paul's knowledge of ideas about the Son of Man to what is now found in the Gospels.⁵⁶ Ps. 8:4, Ezekiel 2:1, etc., and Daniel 7:13 would be known. Paul had lived in Palestine and could have known a variety of speculations, even if he did not use them directly. Dan. 7:13 can be given an individual interpretation, as 1 Enoch 48:2 although the composite nature of this work and the uncertainty of its dating prevent dogmatism.⁵⁷ The son of man can be collective also, as man is in Eph. 2:15. 1 Enoch 48:2 says that the son of man was named in heaven; Ephesians says Christians are in the heavenlies.

We have no article in the Ephesians reference, but this is also true of Son of Man in John 5:27. Ephesians is not talking about the one new man, but only using the illustration of a new man, a new humanity.

6.4.3.2/

6.4.3.2 Adam

This must be considered a possibility because -

- a) Eph. 2:15 has new man not new nation.
- b) Adam means man.⁵⁸
- c) "New" suggests a contrast with the old Adam.
- d) The Pauline contrasts in Rom. 5, 1 Cor. 15 and possibly Col. 3:10.⁵⁹
- e) The writer when thinking of "one flesh" (5:31) has in mind Adam and Eve. Out of the last Adam comes the church, the new humanity.⁶⁰

Paul probably introduced the contrast of Adam/Christ into Christianity. There is no prior evidence, unless Phil. 2 is a pre-Pauline hymn which uses this contrast.

There is not a great deal in the Old Testament about Adam apart from Genesis 3, 4 and 6. The fall of man is only implied at the most in Ps. 51:5, Job 14:4 and Eccl. 7:29 and no link is made with Adam as the first man. Adam in contrast possesses wisdom (Ez. 28:12, cf. Wisdom 10:1ff).

However, subsequent to the Old Testament, there is considerable speculation among Jewish writers, Syr Bar 54:15-19 (death to all, yet each responsible), 2 Esdras 3:21-2, 4:30-2, 7:116f (through the fault of Adam). Jubilees 3:28, 9 shows the effects of the fall upon the animal creation.

The tragedy of Adam's fall was heightened by stressing his previous glorious state.⁶¹ He was not like ordinary mortals. His head reached heaven and eclipsed the sun. He was the equivalent on earth of what God is in heaven. Adam as the first man must be extended above all. "All men come from Adam, because in him all are one".⁶²

He was made from all parts of the earth. R. Osias says the trunk of Adam came from Babylon, his head from Israel and his extremities from other areas. His original dust comes from the four corners of the earth (b. Sanh 38 a-b. Pirke de R Eliezer 11:76, 7). The numerical equivalents of $\overline{D}T\chi$ correspond to the initials of the four/

four cardinal points, east, west, south and north, cf. Sib Oracles 3:24-26.⁶³

The Clementine Homilies, which may contain first century material, carry the glorification of Adam to great length. This is partly because they are pro-Peter and anti-Pauline. They ascribe the apostleship of the Gentiles to Peter and provide a counterpart to Paul's glorification of the second Adam.

6.4.3.2.1 Adam as fallen and restored.

The exile made the Jews conscious of sin. They acknowledged that the popular "false" prophets had been wrong. The Jews collected instead the writings of the "canonical" prophets, whom hitherto they had not liked. The exile "burnt the sense of sin into the very being of the Jewish nation".⁶⁴ At first it was exegesis of Gen. 6:1-4 and then the evil impulse in man, but by the first century A.D. it was Gen. 3 which played the predominant part in speculation on the origin of sin. In The Apocalypse of Moses (usually dated in the late Hasmonean period of the previous century) the unhappy situation of things is traced to the sin of Adam. But there is the promise that he would be resurrected and again take up residence in the third heaven 37:5, 39:1. Salvation is assured for the holy people in the promise of resurrection and restoration to the exalted Adam. Paul's equating of Christ and the second Adam could develop from such an understanding of the function of Adam.⁶⁵

One can certainly see how these speculations on the restoration of Adam would arise, once people traced the origin of their present ills to their forefather and yet at the same time believed that God would remedy the situation. Ephesians like the earlier Paul believes that God has already taken sufficient steps to put things right. The effects of God's action are being seen in the formation of the new man. The Qumran sectaries have a parallel in that they believed the entire glory of Adam would come to them (IQS 4:23, IQH 17:15, cf. CD 3:20).

It was not only fashionable among Jews to see the earliest time (Urzeit) providing a model for the end times (Endzeit). The idea is found in classical thought.⁶⁶

Ephesians/

Ephesians is not specific that the fall of man is traced to the first Adam. There may be hints in 2:2, 3. But the writing is comparatively short and if by Paul we know the author's views on the matter.

6.4.3.3 Adam as the father of the race (Der Stammvater).

This Jewish interest in the restoration of Adam is obviously linked to the conviction that he is the father of the race.⁶⁷ (M Sanhedrin 4:5) The Jewish tradition of a collective Adam who integrated in his body and in the numerical equivalent of his name, all humanity, north, south, east and west without distinction or rank or class or sex (see note 62) is a good parallel to Paul's doctrine of the second Adam as the source of a new humanity, which has no distinction of race, language, social class or sex. This tradition could be a foundation of Pauline thought, if we knew it was earlier.

Jewish thought believes that Adam plays two roles, first as a sinner and secondly as exalted, assuring the salvation of his people.⁶⁸ Paul understands Christ as fulfilling these two roles in his death and resurrection. Adam is only the type of the one who is to come.

The "Stammvater" is not only portrayed as Adam. Eph. 4:8-10 cites Ps. 68:18, which originally referred to the ascent of the king-god to his heavenly throne. This Midrash in Eph. 4:9 could result from older speculation based on legends about the royal man.⁶⁹ Other Old Testament figures are expected in some circles to play a similar role to Adam, e.g. Enoch (2 Enoch 56:1, 64:4, 65:11), Noah (Philo, Praem Poen 23, Quaest in Gen. 2:66), Moses (Philo, Quaest in Ex. 2:46, Syr Bar 18:2) and Jacob Israel (Jubilees 19:18).

However, if Ephesians 2:15 has this thought, the author is not thinking of Christ as the new Adam, only of mankind as restored to its true glory. Doubtless he believes that this is achieved through Christ, the new man, but he does not develop this thought. He is only thinking of the unity of Jew and Gentile which Christ has achieved, not that three entities, Christ, Jew and Gentile have become one.

6.4.3.4 Corporate personality.⁷⁰

The belief in Adam as the representative of the race is often traced to the idea of corporate personality where a plurality finds in one person its expression and representative, so that the fate of all is tied up with the fact of the one. It is not such a common idea in the west. But we can compare the older Japanese outlook where one died for his country, the Russian idea of subornost (e.g. Dostoevsky). John Donne reminded us that "no man is an island",⁷¹ which is the Pauline "no man lives to himself" (Rom. 14:7).

The Jews had individualistic laws such as the regulations for the year of Jubilee to ensure that every man could "dwell under his own vine and fig tree". Jeremiah and Ezekiel stressed individualism. But the corporate idea is found both before and after these prophets (e.g. Achan Jos 7, cf. 2 Sam. 21 and 24). The Servant of Isaiah can be seen as a collective. Israel is called by the name of her founder Israel (Ps. 80 and Is. 5) and sometimes referred to as Jacob (Ps. 14:7, 24:6, 53:6, 79:7). Despite the emphasis in Apocalyptic literature upon individual immortality the hope of the nation is always stressed.

Among the Semites, the group had primacy over the individual.⁷² Punishment extends to children (Ex. 20:5) and blessings extend to others (e.g. Noah, Gen. 7:1, of the family, cf. Obededom in 2 Sam. 6:11). In Hosea, Israel is both a wife and a child.

The solidarity of all Christians with Christ is brought out more closely by the term body in Eph. 2:16. This concept may be derived from Paul's eschatological background,⁷³ the Eucharist,⁷⁴ or more likely from Adamic speculation in the first century.⁷⁵ Paul's doctrine of the solidarity of the new humanity in Christ is intelligible in the framework of Hebrew conceptions.⁷⁶ We are one in Christ as we are one in Adam. Christ is the one true universal man, the representative of the race in whom the two separated halves have returned to complete unity.⁷⁷

Corporate personality is an attractive solution, because it can be used as a plausible explanation for so many Pauline ideas, e.g. being "in Christ" mysticism, the concept of believers as a body, etc. Stoicism, Hellenistic mysticism, Mystery Religions, Near/

Near Eastern Mythology, Platonic and Greek socio-political ideas are no longer needed to explain Paul.⁷⁸

Paul appears to use the idea in Rom. 5:12 of the spread of sin and condemnation (cf. 5:17) and of all being made alive in Christ, with God being all in all (1 Cor. 15:28).

But whereas in the Pauline epistles one can go as far as to say that the new man is identical with Christ (Gal. 2:20) Ephesians is not quite the same. Christ is not the new man. He forms the new man from Jews and Gentiles. This is not the idea of a "Stammvater" who includes his descendants, here they are other folk, not naturally his (even opposed to him), who are joined together. The passage does not say they are incorporated in Christ.

Scholars who find corporate personality in Paul discover it particularly in the Captivity epistles and the terms "body" and "new man" owe much to the concept. Ephesians goes further than Romans 5 and 1 Cor. 15 in linking corporate personality to the concept of the body of Christ, while they do not.⁷⁹ But Ephesians does not do so in our passage.

6.4.4 The first man (Urmensch).

It is correct to say that an essential distinction must be made between the idea of the primordial man and that of the first created man.⁸⁰ The former is the heavenly cosmological figure who provides the pattern for the formation of the earthly man.⁸¹ Philo is concerned with the earthly man, but he does distinguish in Platonic fashion between a heavenly man whose creation is described in Gen. 1 and an earthly man in Gen. 2 (De Opif. 69ff, 133ff, 139ff, Leg All 1:31). The celestial man since he is in the image of God has no part in corruptible or terrestrial substance.⁸² He did not fall and still dwells with God. Philo sees Noah as another prototype of the second creation of mankind.⁸³

It is likely that in the first century A.D., there would be much interchange of thought throughout the cultured Mediterranean world on the First Man.⁸⁴ Its widespread use suggests it is a pre-Christian idea. In fact it is very old. There is the myth of an original man of heavenly origin whose fall into the material world/

world is the explanation of man's double character. He is found in Ras Shamra (or Ugarit, which was a city destroyed in the 13th century B.C.) as a symbolic name of mankind. He is Canaanitic⁸⁵ and is also found in Indian and Norse folklore.⁸⁶ As Gayomard he is found in Magian, Parthian circles, possibly introduced through Judaizing influences. But a direct seedbed (and for gnosticism) may lie in Iranian folk religion.⁸⁷ Gayomard, although essentially a hero found in the later Pahlevi texts, seems to have a history extending back to a primitive conception of him as Gaya.⁸⁸ This is not a very strong foundation for speculation about the importance of a primal man figure (or heavenly man) in Zoroastrianism, for it is not until the much later Pahlevi Bundahes that a fuller myth about Gayomard becomes evident. It is difficult to trace it from Iranian thought into Hellenistic Judaism.⁸⁹ The essential element is however in Orphism.⁹⁰

When we turn to Gnostic writings, we find the first man with a great body in The Apocryphon of John, The Apocalypse of Adam⁹¹ and The Letter of Eugnostus.⁹² The Gospel of Philip has the unique First Man and his children and the man above and the man below (28). 101, 2 says "it is fitting for us to put on the living man" cf. Acts of Philip 86:8ff. *Νῦν οὖν κύριε μου Ἰησοῦ Χριστέ ποιήσον μοι ἀπαντήσαι σοὶ ἐν τῇ ἀέρι καὶ μετραμόρφωσον τὴν κορφὴν τοῦ σωματός μου ἐν ἀγγελικῇ δόξῃ*

The double meaning of man is in The Naassene Sermon. "Adam is the only man whom the earth brought forth. He lay without breath, life or movement like a statue, an image of the heavenly man".⁹³

We have already cited Schlier's evidence for the primal redeemer who comes down from heaven, drives a cleft in the iron wall, which surrounds the world, destroys the hostility of the angels of the nations, gathers together his own, the souls scattered through the world and leads them up in himself, upon his return to heaven.

The Jewish sect of the Elkasaites believed in a mysterious El-Kasia, who is probably the Adam-Kasia of the Nasoreans or proto-Mandaeans.⁹⁴

The Elkasaites identified their Christ with Adam in the sense of an anointed and ruling ideal of man. They believed this Messiah had been incarnated or prefigured in the prophets of the Old Testament.

Hippolytus reports a variety of beliefs concerning a human-like figure of huge dimensions.⁹⁵ The Hermetic Poimandres has the Anthropos, but does not portray him as a redeemer. Poimandres uses the descent of the heavenly man to explain the constitution of men rather than the structure of the world. He is married to nature after his descent through the planets, and receives some of their character. At the death of his seven children, the material body dissolves, but the vital spirit ascends, losing the evil passions as it passes through the spheres of the planets. Unlike Ephesians, there is no trace of a special community related to the heavenly man. But all this shows how close a link there is between Jewish speculation and gnosticism.

For the Mandaeans, the high point of creation is the creation of the first man. Adam's body was produced by the demiurge Ptahil and his associates. But Adam's living essence was derived from the world of light. In the earthly Adam one sees a counterpart of the heavenly or great Adam. From him descend the Mandaeans with souls from the world of light, yet living in the world of darkness. A majority of the Mandaean texts are concerned with the deliverance of these elements of light.⁹⁶

In the Manichaean system which is definitely post-Christian there is the conception of the First Man to whom men rise after death. The literature (particularly the Kephalaia) has Adam, both as ideal humanity and as mankind. The first is the primordial and the second marries Eve. As in Mandaean texts, the two Adams, the one the soul of man and the other his physical and reproductive counterpart overlap and are not clearly separated. The Primal man is in heaven and on earth at the same time. Mani taught that the heavenly man descends into matter with his five sons or elements (fire, wind, water, light, breath) to fight the powers of darkness. This explains the world mixture. God intervened, rescued the heavenly man and defeated Satan. The elements of this heavenly man are a part of each man, but there is no suggestion they form a community. Sometimes he is called the world soul ($\psi\chi\eta\ \alpha\eta\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\omega\nu$). He thus bears a relationship to the old creation.⁹⁷

Gnilka finds the background to Ephesians in the Greek idea of the cosmos as Makroanthropos rather than in the Gnostic Urmensch. Schlier discovers its origin in the primal man redeemer myth of a (Jewish) eastern gnosticism current in the world of New Testament times. This was later copiously developed in heretical Christian gnosticism. It probably entered Christian thought via Jewish circles not very far removed from apocalyptic ones. The link was provided by speculations about Adam (e.g. in Philo) as the ideal man.

Although the concept of the First Man, therefore, is widespread, the parallels are not completely adequate to explain Ephesians. Figures bearing at least some resemblance to the Man of the early Christian centuries have been located in other places and ages. The thought appeals to people of all ages, as seen in the Titans, Polyphemus, Goliath, King Arthur, Paul Bunyan, the Bionic Woman and television personalities like Steve Austin.

Where Ephesians and the New Testament differ from Gnostic ideas is that the First Man and the Redeemer are the same person. This identification is not found in gnostic sources until much later. Pre-Christian thought akin to later gnosticism knows an Urmensch but not an Urmensch Redeemer.⁹⁸ Paul differs also in that his second man stands at the end of the development of things whereas in the oriental myth the development of the world begins with his fall. Eastern thought may have provided the idea of a first man more glorious than Adam,⁹⁹ but the idea of him as a redeemed redeemer is later in Gnostic writings and based on ideas such as those in Ephesians, rather than the other way around.¹⁰⁰

The terms man and body¹⁰¹ show the intimate link between the people of God but neither verse 15 nor verse 16 are concerned with the relationship of Christ to believers, but with what he has done to restore their relationship to each other and to God. 2:15 shows what has already been achieved. 4:12, 13 shows the goal to which men strive. In this latter passage "body" precedes "man" which is the reverse of 2:15.¹⁰²

We have already observed how many argue that the new man is Christ with Jew and Gentile added to him. This is similar to the Valentinians,/

Valentinians, where Jesus, the Church and Sophia form a complete and powerful union of their bodies.¹⁰³ This connection of Christ and his people is shown by the prefix *σύν* found several times in 2:6 (cf. 3:17 and 3:21). But this thought is not found here. His people are only fellow citizens with the saints and the household of God not one person with him. The nearest link with Christ is that he is the cornerstone of the building. There are strong but not convincing arguments for seeing a reference to Jew and Gentile being one in Christ. But it does not say "the one new man" nor that we are the one body of Christ.

As "one new man" there is access to the Father through Christ. The new man is the "dwelling of God"¹⁰⁴ (v.22, cf. Barth p.307). The new man is not simply a new race, but a person.¹⁰⁵ Hence God deals with men as a whole, as a single individual belonging to Christ. Ephesians uses the singular elsewhere, "a single bride" (5:22ff), a full grown man (4:13) and one body.¹⁰⁶ Thus the "one" of 15 can refer back to the "one" of 14 as well as forward to 16.¹⁰⁷

6.5 Does Ephesians 2:15 teach universalism?

Does "one new man" suggest the ultimate reconciliation of all to God, with all knowing the power of his love, forgiveness and salvation? It could do. The implication of Ephesians is universalism (cf. 1:10) but not necessarily so.¹⁰⁸ Christ will fill all things (4:10) but 2:15 does not say that all will be in the body or form the new man. The body, the church, has something which will be under its control (1:22, 23). The church will witness to the principalities and powers (3:10) but it is not said that they will become part of the church. 5:6 speaks against universalism.

Paul does not teach universalism (e.g. Rom. 2:8, Phil. 3:19, 2 Thess. 1:8, 9, 2:8) so unless there is a lapse here, or a holding of two views in tension or a change of view, Ephesians, if it does teach universalism, would not then be by Paul. The same is true of Colossians which says Christ reconciles all things (1:20).

6.6 Ποιῶν εἰρήνην

The verb εἰρηνοποιεῖν which we find in Col. 1:20 (cf. James 3:18) is not used. Ποιῶν fits better with κτίσω and εἰρήνη is kept therefore as parallel to the word in 14 and 17. The verb illustrates the act of creation, just as in the next clause "killing the enmity" illustrates the reconciliation. Each of the participles is able to explain what immediately precedes. "Making peace" connects better with v.15 than with v.16.¹⁰⁹

No longer is Christ just the peace, he is actually making peace.¹¹⁰ It is the present tense. Jesus continues to make peace available to a wider and increasing group of people. The present may also emphasize its character of permanence and actuality. Peace is dynamic and always actual.¹¹¹ Both insights are possible, but the former is not so obvious from the context, which envisages the two groups as already one.

This verse has used the idea of corporate personality and given a positive purpose to Christ's work of peace in order that he might create (cf. the new creation and rabbinic ideas of proselytes) the two into one new personality. This is how he makes peace. The next verse will further enlarge upon this purpose.

CHAPTER SEVEN. EPHESIANS 2:16

The verse reads "and in order that he might reconcile us both to God in one body through the cross, bringing the hostility to an end".

The clause is dependent upon the *ἵνα* of 2:15 and the *καὶ* suggests that the *ἀποκαταλλάξῃ* is parallel to *κτίσῃ* in that verse. The two clauses of 15b and 16 thus stand side by side¹ rather than one being dependent upon the other in a kind of progression.² If a progression had been intended, the *ἵνα* would have been repeated. Hence verse 16 expresses the second part of Christ's purpose. God designed not only to unite together the two hostile divisions of mankind, but to reconcile the united race to God. Each kind of hostility, Christ resolved to remove. It might seem obvious to us that if they are made one (v.15) then they are reconciled. But the writer wishes to stress these two related aspects separately. The order is interesting. He places the formation of "one new man" before the reconciliation to God. In fact the change from reconciliation of Jew and Gentile to reconciliation to God takes place here. This clause is thus more theological and less sociological than v.15b. Our verse shows that the theological aspect of reconciliation to God (of Eph. 1) has not been forgotten in chapter 2. Even Jewish-Gentile social relationships are a theological matter. There would have been no trouble at all if men had not sinned against God.³ God had to begin again and with an individual Abraham and his descendants including Christ, through whom his plan can widen to include Gentiles. Ephesians stresses God's plan.

7.1 Ἀποκαταλλάξῃ

Reconciliation in the New Testament is basically a Pauline concept.⁴ It is one of the ways in which Paul interprets the effects of the Christ event. The word refers to the restoration of people to a status of friendship and intimacy; to a change or alteration in the relationships between individual persons or groups of persons.

Four of the six New Testament passages which have the concept are in the accepted Pauline letters, Romans 5:10, 11; 11:15; 1 Cor. 7:11 and 2 Cor. 5:18-20. The other two are Col. 1:20, 21⁵ and here./

here. This suggests the concept is from the Pauline tradition rather than from a hymnic tradition that the writer is alleged to have used. But reconciliation is claimed by many scholars to have a different emphasis in Colossians and Ephesians from what is found in Paul, being not so much freedom from condemnation, consciousness of adoption or the ground of assurance but free access to God.⁶ It is now all inclusive but if in Colossians and Ephesians the unusual form of the word *ἡποκατα*.. not *κατα*.. means it comes from a hymnic tradition, it still need not be earlier than Rom. 5 or 2 Cor. 5. On the other hand Paul may not be the originator of the concept in Christian circles. It could be a concept that he inherited.

It is the least metaphorical of the soteriological concepts (cf. justification, sacrifice, redemption) and like forgiveness is personal. The concept does not appear to be taken up in the second century.⁷

7.1.1 Antecedents

Reconciliation as a soteriological term has religious antecedents in the LXX but not in the religious language of Greek literature. The LXX uses it only in 2 Macc. 1:5, 5:11-20, 7:18, 33 and 8:29 where the thought is that God can be angry with his people and can give up his anger, e.g. 1:5 reads "may he hear your prayers and be reconciled to you". As in Ephesians, 2 Maccabees has reconciliation between man (1:5) and of man with God (7:23, 8:29). *Ἀλλάσσω* is found in Test Jos 14:2 and *διαλλάσσω* in Mt. 5:24 and 1 Sam. 29:4.

The passages from 2 Maccabees may suggest that for Paul reconciliation means that God gives up his anger against his people by removing the cause of anger. The marriage passage in 1 Cor. 7:11 also suggests that both partners have been affected. Paul never goes so far as to say in the passive that God is reconciled to man, even if both parties have been affected by what has taken place. Paul uses *καταλλάγηναι* for this.⁸ The passive formula is in Josephus Ant 6:143 where Samuel intreated God to be reconciled to Saul and not to be angry with him.⁹

Qumran has justification by grace alone, but not reconciliation,¹⁰ although IQS 9:5bf is close to the idea. "In those days they shall choose from among the members of the community a holy house for Aaron, that infinite holiness may be assembled together and a house of unitedness for Israel, all those who walk in perfection".¹¹ Thus the thought is known, if seldom stressed in contemporary Judaism.

Vergil could speak of an end time peace,¹² but it is not really reconciliation. The Hellenistic world only knows God as the divine, the power and principle of order of the cosmos.

The simple verb ἀλλάσσω (the root ἀλλ means "a making otherwise") from the root ἄλλος has two meanings:- (1) to alter, change (Gal. 4:20 and 1 Cor. 15:51f) and (2) to exchange, barter (Rom. 1:23).¹³

The most common prefix to form a compound verb in Greek is κατά which is used with ἀλλάσσω in 2 Cor. 5:18-20 and Rom. 5:10. Καταλλάσσω was used at this time with the same meaning as the simple form, though perhaps with an increased emphasis.¹⁴ There was a Hellenistic trend of avoiding the simple form of a verb.¹⁵

Ἀποκαταλλάσσω seems to be the writer of Colossians' own coinage.¹⁶ Ἀπό can strengthen a verb (ἀπεργάζομαι) or give the meaning "again".¹⁷ The latter does not fit the Ephesians context. The Gentiles had always been separated. There was never a time when they enjoyed a special relationship. The idea of a restoration of a former unity like that before sin came and before the Jews were a privileged people fits Colossians better than Eph. 2:16,¹⁸ since Colossians does not emphasize the Jewish-Gentile division and Jewish privilege.

The use of two prepositions suggests Ephesians wishes to stress things. He does this in other ways, through placing synonyms adjacent to one another and even coining a superlative comparative word in 3:8. We have in 2:16 the aorist tense emphasizing the completeness of the action.

Like the verb "to create", God is usually the subject of reconcile. He takes the initiative. God and man are not equal partners. This/

This was the case in the Old Testament where the conditions were laid down by Yahweh and covenants are similar in form to the Suzerainty Covenants of the Hittites and the Mesopotamians.¹⁹ In Ephesians, Christ is the subject but this is no problem when we remember the high Christology of the letter and that Christ is the agent of the Father.

7.2 Τὸς ἀμφότερους

The writer once again uses the word "both" rather than "two". Christ reconciles them (Jew and Gentile) together for both had offended God.²⁰ The law which separated them is overcome and they are reconciled to each other. "Both" speaks of togetherness rather than of their former separateness.

The reconciliation of "both" makes Paul's concern to win Jews in Romans 9-11 all the more imperative. Gentiles are being visibly reconciled to God, while the Jews seem hostile to God and the Messiah he has provided. Paul is concerned to win the heathen and to secure the Jews' final conversion to God. It was particularly incumbent upon him now that the Messiah has appeared. Jews having refused to recognise him means paradoxically that they need a mission too.²¹ Jews and Gentiles need to enter the kingdom.²² All has to be summed up in Christ.²³

7.3 Ἐν ἑνὶ σώματι

Again the word "one" is stressed. It is not a body, but one body as in vv.14, 15 (but it is not "the body" or "the body of Christ"). It stresses the one single body instead of the previous two bodies. "One" shows it refers to Jew and Gentile.²⁴ It cannot be exclusively the body of Christ without reference to the church.²⁵ This in fact answers a question which is secondary. The question should be whether the phrase's obvious primary reference to Jew and Gentile demands that it also refers to Christ.

There is no article, which is fairly exceptional for a noun in our passage (only δόγμασι, εἰρήνῃν (v.16) cf. πνεύματι²⁶ (v.18)). But this need not surprise us if "one" is equivalent to the indefinite article (cf. 4:4). This again suggests it is not a specific reference to the body of Christ. This important question demands some discussion.

7.3.1 Is the term "body" in the Pauline literature always to be taken literally, or is it sometimes used as a metaphor?

Is the term "body" used literally of the mystical body of Christ, or is it sometimes used to illustrate the fellowship of believers? Does the phrase "body of Christ", which is not in Paul's early letters, have particular significance?

It is widely held by scholars that the church is literally the body of Christ²⁷ and is directly linked to Christ's crucified, risen and glorified body. Believers are part of Christ, belonging to the one body which he now possesses. The term therefore illustrates not merely the relationship of Christians to each other, but their relationship to Christ, where he is not simply their leader but they are really part of him. It is argued that if Paul meant only a metaphor in his writings, he did not make this clear and body was in any case a very misleading term to use.²⁸

Paul certainly links the term body very closely with the church and with Christ.²⁹ According to the accounts of his conversion in Acts, he realised that in persecuting the Church, he was persecuting Christ (Acts 26:14).³⁰

Eucharistic teaching would encourage the idea of communion in the body,³¹ since 1 Cor. 10:16, 17 says that Christians at the Lord's Table participate in the body of Christ. 1 Cor. 11:24 and 27 suggest that 11:29 refers to the crucified body of Christ, but there could be a reference to the church body, since the Corinthians at the table showed a lack of concern for the church and failed to see its oneness because of their divisions (1 Cor. 10:17).

Rom. 7:4 is sometimes understood as referring to Christ's body the church,³² but most understand it as a reference to the death of Christ. It is the death of Christ which sets men free from the law, just as a woman is set free by her husband's death.

The literal view of the church as the body of Christ insists on the physiological and historical effect of the resurrection. By this event Jesus' physical body was transmuted into a spiritual one without/

without losing contact with the world of matter and of time, while the head of the body is in heaven and assures and supplies life to the body. "Alive or dead, we already have our portion through the Spirit in the new corporeality, which one day will be the only one".³³

Today we have metaphysical difficulties with the resurrection as shown by the many books on the subject.³⁴ The literal view helps us to understand how Christ lives after his death. The early church, however, did have some metaphysical difficulties too, for how could flesh and blood enter the kingdom of God (1 Cor. 15:50)? It is true that Christians conceived of a mystical union of being in Christ and of being in the heavenlies. But Jesus was complete in himself and had a whole body before the church began to be formed.

The term is an obvious metaphor and one which we use frequently,³⁵ e.g. "anybody" or "the body of the kirk". The term head is also used, e.g. head boy, head of state. It can be symbolic of the person as a whole, the head only being portrayed on a stamp, coin or statue. It is likely therefore that "we may get nearer to the writer's mind, if instead of trying to find in these images (body, temple, bride) profound and subtle theological speculations, we are content to find simple and beautiful but rather vague images of the unity of the church."³⁶ It is true that he does use other metaphors, but we have to accept that he says more explicitly "we are members of his body" (5:30). "The distinctive thing about body language (compared with other images) is that it constantly merges into other uses, which are not just figurative."³⁷ The metaphor in Paul does appear to be used so vividly as to suggest it is more than metaphorical (e.g. 1 Cor. 12:12-17) but in the Old Testament, metaphors can be extremely vivid and still be only metaphors.³⁸ Body in the New Testament is likewise a vivid metaphor. "From one point of view it (the church) is the body of Christ, from other points of view not. We have no right to speculate with it and draw from it conclusions which are not in Paul and then father them on Paul".³⁹

Body/

Body is an apt metaphor; it suggests life, diversity, unity and the contrast of the head with the remainder. It is a metaphor which could develop independently in various realms of thought, without there necessarily being a connecting link. If one begins with it as an illustration of diversity, one would soon begin to talk of the head, if the trend of the discussion required it. The context of a passage would dictate how the metaphor would be used. Colossians, for example, would demand the illustration of headship.

We cannot take body imagery absolutely literally. Is Christ just a head? Is this body really one with the body of Christ which has hands and feet? Am I or someone else part of this hand or that foot? Do some Christians belong to the left hand and others to the right? To say that in Ephesians it is either literal or metaphorical in an exclusive sense may be unnecessary.

It would be possible to have the article with "body" and still be metaphorical, but if it were intended to be literal in 2:16 we would have expected the article or the adjective "his"⁴⁰ or the words "of Christ". Nothing so specific is suggested.⁴¹ Ephesians, irrespective of whether or not an article is implied, is hardly likely to be suggesting that Christ gave one body in death for the Jews and another for the Gentiles. Such a thought would be suggested, if the writer were emphasising one physical body which Christ gave in death. Just as Adam and Eve became one flesh, so Gentile and Jew form one body, building and bride.⁴² In 4:12 the two metaphors building and body are found together. Bride and body occur alongside each other in 5:28, 29.

7.3.2 Possible parallels in Paul.

Romans 12 and 1 Cor. 12 use the illustration of the various parts of the body to illustrate the function of the members of the local church, but in Ephesians and Colossians the body is clearly stated to have Christ as the head. This concept may be the keystone of Paul's theology⁴³ or be merely one of several terms which Paul uses to describe the unity of the church, such as building and bride.⁴⁴

1 Cor. 12:12 is the most striking text, where the word Christ is used, when we would expect "church". This shows Colossians and Ephesians are not so far different. Colossians has a cosmic context, /

context, so whereas body was Christological in emphasis, it is now ecclesiological.⁴⁵ Paul's progress in thought from 1 Corinthians and Romans may have been stimulated by his consideration of issues involved in the Colossians heresy⁴⁶ and the need to emphasize such matters as corporate Christian fellowship in Christ and our dependence upon him and his supremacy in the universe. The whole church rather than the local church is now described as a body.⁴⁷

This is understandable, since merely to show that Christ was just the head of local communities of believers would not have helped his argument. He wants to show that Christ is supreme. Christ is in control of the cosmos (Col. 1:16, 17). He does not go on to say that this means that the church encompasses the whole cosmos. He says that Christ is the head of the body of the church (1:18) and through him all things are to be reconciled (1:20). This teaches that the church is used by Christ but does not say that the principalities and powers of 1:16 are part of his body.⁴⁸ 1:18 and 24 limit the body to the church. The cosmos is never called a body.

In Colossians and Ephesians the writer(s) talks about the head (Col. 1:18, Eph. 4:15) and growth. He may reflect the medical understanding of Hippocrates as summarised by the later Galen,⁴⁹ who emphasized the brain as the origin of power.

The word head is not found in 1 Cor. 12 and Rom. 12 but could be implied in 1 Cor. 12:5 and 12. Paul would hardly suggest any other member is the head not even himself or the apostles (1 Cor. 12:28).⁵⁰ The analogy of body would be further elaborated and Christ be automatically described as the head. This is what we find in Colossians and Ephesians. Paul would not think of a torso or of a head without a body.⁵¹

Once we talk about a body, we soon begin to talk about growth and the head. If the writer can jump from a body to a building (2:21), he can easily move from talking about a body to using the head as an illustration. If Christ is linked with the one body, he can be no other than the head. He cannot be a subordinate part, which is involved in the process of growth. The body can grow, but Christ the head cannot.⁵² The statement of growing up into the head (4:15) is not so strange. The thought determines the unusual development/

development of the metaphor as in the peculiar horticulture of Rom. 11:24. Ephesians says the temple grows (2:21) and the body builds (4:16).⁵³

The body has to grow if it is to include more Jews and more Gentiles and fill the cosmos. The use of the term head is not so unusual when we remember how frequently it is found in the Old Testament (e.g. Deut. 28:13, Jdg. 10:18, 2 Sam. 22:44, Is. 7:8ff and 9:14). The head is at the top of the body⁵⁴ and is what makes people distinctive. It can represent the whole person as on a coin. It is the part which protrudes and which if cut off causes instant death (hence beheading and the use of the guillotine) whereas severance of hand or foot does not. It is more vital than the heart. Paul has been vindicated by an illustration which makes this clear for us. The transplanting of a baboon's heart into a human being can arouse ethical discussion but nothing like the transplanting of a baboon's head would do, especially if the operation were successful.

The importance of the head is seen in many areas, e.g. headhunters who prize heads as relics. Since man's earliest religions the human head has been a focus of superstitious interest and "many peoples have at a certain stage of their development observed special rites in connection with the head."⁵⁵ The head is found, for example, throughout Celtic traditions not only as a separate cult, but bound up with all the other cults. It is the most typical Celtic religious symbol. Celts regarded it as symbolic of divinity and the powers of the other world.⁵⁶

Col. 2:9 seems to be a reference to the incarnate Christ being regarded as divine (cf. Col. 1:22). There is no indication that the writer is thinking of the church prior to v.10.⁵⁷ Colossians is saying that God has not delegated the divine powers to supernatural beings which the Colossian heresy would seem to suggest, but that the fulness of them dwells in Christ.

Col. 1:22 is a close parallel to Eph. 2:16, but in the Colossian passage the body is not the church, for when this is so as in v.24 it is clearly stated. 1:22 refers to the body of flesh which was sacrificed. The term flesh shows that the writer means the human body of Christ and not the church. Eph. 2:16 uses the terminology differently./

differently. It becomes one body not a body of flesh. Whereas in Colossians it is clearly not the church, in Eph. 2:16 it has some connection with the church.

Col. 3:15 apparently uses the term in a metaphorical way, since it does not say the body of Christ, nor link body with the reference to Christ in the previous clause. We observe therefore that Colossians, either independently or in using Paul, or as Paul himself, develops and uses the metaphor of body to meet the needs of the epistle and its readers. The writer uses σώμα of his own body in 2:5.

Ephesians is concerned with the headship of Christ in the church rather than the universe. The picture of a body is used as a natural illustration.

Eph. 4:4 like 2:16 uses the term "body" not "body of Christ" and seems to suggest a separate entity from the Lord (4:5) although closely associated with spirit in 4:4. The church must maintain the unity, because there is one body and one spirit. One spirit dwells within them. This body is one church, one family in heaven and on earth (3:15). The Holy Spirit dwells in this body.⁵⁸ 4:12 would therefore suggest that the body of Christ means the body which belongs to Christ. Christ himself does not need to be built up.

Eph. 1:23 says the church is his body, he is the head, the fulness of what is filled (i.e. the church).⁵⁹ The body is thus clearly linked to Christ as the source of life, but is not literally his body. Christ fills the church and fills the universe. In 2:16 the writer does not even go as far as to speak of the connection in the one body of Christ. He simply uses a metaphor.

7.3.3 A holistic view?

T. Schmidt in Der Leib Christi, Leipzig 1919, suggested that Paul borrowed the idea of community as a body from Hellenistic popular philosophy. This suggestion led to renewed discussion as to whether the term body always has reference to a man's physical body, or if it can be used for the whole man.⁶⁰ The latter means that man/

man not only has a body but he is body, and Paul uses the word of encounter rather than of man as a substance in the material world. The term body thus speaks of encounter with the divine Lord and also of his presence in the church. But it appears to be true that in most New Testament references it refers to man's physical body.⁶¹ Its ancient Greek background supports this as well as the fact that both flesh and blood are needed in the Eucharist.⁶²

There are doubtless blurred edges⁶³ and Rom 12:1 and 8:10 are not convincingly shown to be solely physical references. There are other views besides these two. Body and soul can overlap in meaning. They are not exclusive ideas as Gundry assumes. E. Beest suggests that *σῶμα* may be used for man when he is in activity, *νοῦς* when he is thinking and *σάρξ* as showing him prone to sin. We must not be too rigorous in dividing into parts.⁶⁴

Ephesians could have the holistic view in 2:16, if we were certain that he is talking about the literal body of Christ parallel to "in his blood". But if he is using a metaphor or if the word is parallel to "one new man" than it is unlikely.

7.3.4 Background to the thought.

The investigation of the background to the concept "body" has led to what Jewett calls (op cit p.6) a fruitless one, concerning whether Paul was more influenced by Judaism or Hellenism. But some discussion is necessary to elucidate its meaning here.

7.3.4.1 Non-Jewish

Σῶμα is known from Homer onwards.⁶⁵ It is used in New Testament times of the cosmos. Hellenistic popular philosophy was familiar with this.⁶⁶ Plato saw the world and its contents as only a shadow of the real world beyond. He thus differed from Heraclitus, who had recognised no reality which was not corporeal.⁶⁷ The Orphic fragment 168 (2nd Cent. A.D.?) uses an older oriental thought when it depicts the universe as the body of Zeus, with heaven as the head, /

head, the sun as the eyes, etc.

Ζεὺς κεφαλὴ. Ζεὺς μέσσα Διὸς δ' ἐκ πάντα τέτυκται.
 Ἐν δὲ δέρας βασιλείου ἐν ᾧ τάδε πάντα κυκλεῖται
 Πάντα γὰρ ἐν Ζηνὸς μεγάλῃ. Τάδε σῶρατι κείται.⁶⁸

In Stoicism it is commonplace to understand the state as a body in which each member has a part to play⁶⁹ and in later Stoicism the metaphor is extended to the universe as a whole of which men form a part.⁷⁰

Seneca (4-65 A.D.) said men are members of the one great body (corpus). The emperor is the soul of the commonwealth, which is his body.⁷¹ This Stoic thought has a parallel in the teaching found in Ephesians of the universe filling up and being filled by God (1:10, 23). Before Seneca there is no evidence of a group actually being called a body.⁷² But there was popular Hellenistic usage of *σῶρα* in comparison with society.⁷³ It is found in Jewish thought, which has been influenced by Greek ideas, such as we find in Eccles 1:1-10, Wisdom 7:24. *Σῶρα* is also used for the State, where the members are called *μέρη*. Philo (De Spec 3:131) says "that every age and every part of the nation regarded as of a single body may be united in one and the same fellowship, making peace and good order their aim". He shows that proselytes are linked with other Jews and seem to be the separate parts of a single living being, which is compacted and unified by their fellowship in it (De Virt 103 cf. 182). Cicero (De Officiis 3:5) also likens the body to human society.

Most Scandinavian, French and English-speaking scholars would agree with F. Mussner, who considers the Greek and Roman classical background (e.g. Plutarch, Livy, Seneca and Tacitus) sufficient to explain the Pauline usage of the image, which he develops.⁷⁴ Paul would see the growing church throughout the empire as a universal ekklesia, a greater empire along the same lines, the kingdom of God in which we are "more than conquerors". This would be a foreshadowing of the later claims of the church of Rome and the view of Augustine.⁷⁵ Once the church was compared to the empire, the body concept would suggest itself, even if Paul had not already thought of it. But he probably had.

7.3.4.2 The Jewish background.

The difficulty here is that body is not linked to such Old Testament concepts as corporate personality⁷⁶ since there is no real frequent corresponding Hebrew word. The LXX has *σῶμα* one hundred and forty-one times but only twice (Job 40:32 and Gen. 15:11) does it refer to something other than the body, dead or alive of a human being. It never refers to inanimate objects. It can usually be replaced without loss of meaning by the personal pronoun, e.g. Job 6:4, Prov. 11:17. A contrast between soul and body is found in the literature which has more Hellenistic influence (Wisdom 9:15, 2 Macc 6:30). Deut. 28:13 and 44 have the metaphor of head (Israel) in contrast to tail (cf. Is. 9:14 and the metaphor of feet). Judges 10:18 uses head in the sense of lordship. David is the head of the nation (2 Sam. 22:44). Is. 7:8ff speaks of Damascus as the head of Syria, but does not proceed to use the analogy of other parts of the body.

Is. 1:4-6 speaks of Judah as a body sick from head to foot and Dan. 2 has the image of a man representing successive empires.

Mankind is not called the body of Adam⁷⁷ but the more significant Hebrew word for the individual (*nephesh*) is used in the singular in a collective sense (Lev. 26:15, Num. 21:5, Is. 46:2, 47:14, Ps. 124:7, etc.).

There is the servant concept of Isaiah and the idea of the elect having unity with the Messiah.⁷⁸ The Jewish background, therefore, prepares for the idea⁷⁹ but before the Greek language was used it could not be expressed. The Greek word *σῶμα* through Christian usage becomes a positive word rather than a negative one and can be used to express the original Hebrew idea.⁸⁰ Thus although the use of *σῶμα* to depict the church is not a natural development from Hebrew vocabulary, there are many antecedents to suggest the imagery. If "one new man" has a Jewish background it is likely that body has also.⁸¹

7.3.4.3/

7.3.4.3 Use of the thought.

7.3.4.3.1 The Apostolic Fathers.

They use the image or reality of the body frequently.⁸² Didache 9:4 implies the eucharistic body. "Just as this piece of bread was scattered over the mountains, so let your church be gathered together from the ends of the earth". 2 Clement, His kingdom would come "when the two shall be one ... and the outside (body) be like the inside (soul) (12) ... "a living church is the body of Christ ... God made man male and female. The male is Christ, the female is the church ... The church which was spiritual was revealed in the flesh of Christ, showing us that if anyone of us guards her in the flesh and does not corrupt her, he will get her back again in the Holy Spirit ... who outrages the flesh outrages the church" (14). Hermas (Parables) says "after the wicked are cast out" the church of God will be one body, one mind, one faith, one love (9:18).⁸³

Ignatius also has the metaphor of the head.⁸⁴

7.3.4.3.2 The Gnostics.

It appears strange that Gnostics should use the term body, since they did not have much regard for the body as such. As a negative term in their minds, it was not the best term to illustrate anything that was good. They seem inconsistent to use it at all in a positive way. In fact they see it as a kind of garment or prison of the soul. They had the myth of the Primal Man in "which the souls of all men belong to one cosmic pneumatic body, which as Primal Man is said to have ended up in the matter, while the members of this body are then to be gathered again into one body by the redeemer and brought back to heaven."⁸⁵

Many hold that Ephesians presuppose the gnostic notion of the Anthropos Redeemer, Revealer figure, who constitutes one huge body, the head being the deity, the body the world.⁸⁶

The likelihood of gnostic influence in Ephesians is not so strong as for the cosmic wall and the first man. The sources are late and/

and it can be claimed that the positive concept of body is only found in non-gnostic writings such as Ignatius, Hermas and 2 Clement and derived from Paul.⁸⁷

Acts of Thomas 48 teaches the consubstantiality of the redeemer with the redeemed and of the redeemer as the head of the race who follows him, when he ascends.

Compare The Odes of Solomon 17:15 (probably not Gnostic): "Thus they are become members to me and I their head". This may be dependent upon Ephesians.

The saved community forming the members of the body of which Jesus is the head certainly becomes a gnostic idea, e.g. Χριστὸν ἦρεν οὖν τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ὃ περ' ὁμοούσιον ἦν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ (Valentinian Exc ex Theod 42).

In The Naassene Preaching Hipp Ref. 5:6-11 there is an upper man Adamos and a lower man. The concept of the all as a man who is a giant cosmic being is also found (8:12 citing Monoimus the Arabian).

The Aeon of the Corpus Hermetica 11:4 is described as follows:

Τὸ δὲ πᾶν τοῦτο σῶμα ἐν ᾧ τὰ πάντα ἐστὶ σῶματα
 ψυχὴ πλήρης τοῦ νοῦ καὶ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐντὸς μὲν αὐτὸ
 πληροῖ ἐκτὸς δὲ περιλαμβάνει ζωοποιούσα τὸ πᾶν

Some of these writings are close to orthodox Christianity. They would possibly know Ephesians and this be the inspiration of their thought, rather than the influence being in the opposite direction.⁸⁸ This view is supported by their inconsistent use of such concepts as head, body, members. However within the limited range of the Pauline Corpus one has a range of usages and the gnostic material covers a greater range in both time and area.⁸⁹

There is no unanimity of opinion about the influence of gnostic terminology on the New Testament. Bultmann and Kasemann think that gnostic terminology affects the earlier Pauline Epistles, although/

although Kasemann thinks that Ephesians and Colossians used it so differently that they cannot have a common origin with Paul. Schlier on the other hand believes gnosticism affects Ephesians and Colossians only and not the earlier Paul, since the gnostics use the term body of the relationship of members to the head not of their relationship to one another.⁹⁰

There is a fundamental difference between Paul and the gnostics in the idea of the body itself. We have mentioned how Gnostics regard the body as simply the clothing or prison of the soul. The heavenly man wears believers as a garment, they are not really part of him, with no intimate relationship. He just draws them to himself and takes them to heaven.⁹¹ This thought of shedding the body and putting on a new one is found in 2 Cor. 5, but not where body is used of the church as in Eph. 2:16.

The possibility of a gnostic origin for Ephesians cannot be dismissed entirely, especially if the letter has links with Colossians and with Ephesus. Assuming Paul wrote Ephesians, his two years in Ephesus would make him aware of its cult, which could be a kind of proto-gnosticism. He was influential in having some magical books burnt (Acts 19:19).⁹² But we cannot be sure whether these books were similar to gnosticism; they could be akin to Mystery Religions or a local religion.

The Colossian heresy has traditionally been thought to be a kind of Jewish pre-gnosticism. It was from Eleusis in Asia Minor that the Mysteries of Cybele and Attis were elaborated. The mysteries and legends about Artemis and some which concerned Apollo took shape at Ephesus. Pergamum was not far away. Paul took note of the religious atmosphere at Corinth and Athens, and would do so in a much longer stay at Ephesus. Even if Ephesians were written by a disciple, some of this atmosphere could have passed on to him, or he may have been an Ephesian.

The gnostic origin of the ideas of body and its head are not proven. The seeds of the idea may be present in the cosmic ideas that Jewish and Gnostic⁹³ literature shared. But the developed imagery which we find in the gnostic literature is later than Ephesians and probably/

probably dependent upon Christian writings.

We conclude that the Jewish background is best, although the writer uses a Greek word with no real Jewish parallel. It is prompted by the use of the metaphor in 1 Cor. 12 and Romans 12. It is a metaphor like building and temple, but more vivid because of the nature of the term with its wide background and through the fact that Christ did have a literal body. The other metaphors cannot be applied to Christ in such a way. In using the term the writer is indebted to Jewish ideas of corporate personality, but he does not go as far as to say they form one body with Christ.⁹⁴

"Body" is here in juxtaposition to "both" and parallels "one new man".⁹⁵ If it is placed alongside "in his blood", "flesh", "cross", etc., as another reference to the death of Christ, we have too long a list of parallels. It also gives the clause two references to the cross. If this were intended "body" would be more specifically defined as the body of Christ, or as his body.⁹⁶ "One" would also be superfluous.⁹⁷ The literal body may not necessarily refer to the cross. If it were literally the body of Christ, risen and glorified, the argument would be strengthened. But the ambiguity of the words means Eph. 2:16 should not be used for proving a direct identity of church with the earthly historical body of Christ.

"One body" is more likely to be the church comprised of Jew and Gentile.⁹⁸ If the body is formed in Christ, it might appear to be both Christ and the church.⁹⁹ But it is Christ who reconciles, not himself but Jew and Gentile in one body. If it were Christ's body, it would at least say "in his body". Church and body are closely connected but not identical.

Christ is not mentioned here in relation to the body. If he were, he would be called the head as in 4:15. Eph. 2:16 is closer in thought to Rom. 12 and 1 Cor. 12 than it is to other verses in Ephesians.¹⁰⁰

The aorist speaks of a specific act of incorporation by Christ. This is probably not through the Eucharist or Baptism, but through the cross and the response to preaching, which are mentioned in 2:16, 17. One body is not parallel to "one spirit"¹⁰¹ in v.18, which/

which is the agent like "cross", "flesh". The parallel to body in that verse is *ΚΑΤΟΙΚΗΤΗΡΙΟΝ*.

7.4 τῷ θεῷ

The dative defines the person with whom the reconciliation has been secured.¹⁰² In 1 Sam. 29:4, David reconciles himself to God through a feat he performs himself, but here the action is by Christ. The reconciliation is to God, since the division between Jew and Gentile is not a superficial one, but merely the symptom of a deeper problem. Both are separate from God and need to be reconciled to him, as well as to each other. The estranged man to God relationship rather than the Jewish-Gentile is now stressed as the underlying cause of trouble.

The two words *τῷ θεῷ* show the goal and purpose (1:10). Christ's task is to bring final and complete unity under God. The cosmic aspect may be absent, but it is implied and a necessary stage is expanded. This is the mystery. All has now been revealed. Christ has come. He has reconciled Jew and Gentile¹⁰³ and reconciled both to God. All individuals are as yet not reconciled, but the final plan has been revealed and is now clearly in operation. Whether all are to be reconciled or only subjected is not stated in this passage and need not concern us. Colossians suggests the latter. Ephesians as an independent writing could teach the former,¹⁰⁴ but as we have seen (see section 6.5) universalism is out of harmony with Paul.

7.5 Διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ

Salvation through the cross is distinct from Gnostic ideas of redemption by a revealer. We have already rejected the suggestion that the words are an addition to an earlier hymn.¹⁰⁵ They are fundamental in a Christian context, which believes in the work of the cross. They root this pacification and reconciliation firmly in history.¹⁰⁶ The cross is not mentioned elsewhere in Ephesians, although it is a Pauline word, speaking of the atonement and of shame and foolishness.¹⁰⁷ But our passage has the related expressions, blood,¹⁰⁸ flesh, etc., used in tandem.

Does the phrase relate to the preceding or subsequent clauses? Bleek follows the Syriac, Tertullian and Pelagius who understand the former. This means the second *ἐν αὐτῷ* of the passage in 2:16 refers to "cross" or to Christ as parallel to the cross. The Vulgate and Luther refer *ἐν αὐτῷ* to Christ, but Bengel and Semler refer it to body. Stoeckhardt and Ewald join the words with what follows "after he had slain the enmity by the cross through himself", which means that it repeats and emphasizes what has been said in 14b and 15. This is a possible translation, but the word order does not support it.

If *ἐν ἑαυτῷ* were the crucified body of Christ who obtained the reconciliation, the phrase "through the cross" could be merely explanatory, that is "by the one offering of himself".¹⁰⁹

This leads us to discuss the significance of *διὰ*. It is not likely to mean "because" or "with a view to" (prospective view) which would require the accusative.¹¹⁰

It does not mean "in spite of" the cross. The cross was the designed method (Eph. 1:5-7, cf. Acts 2:23 and Joseph in Gen. 45: 7, 8). It is instrumental¹¹¹ and is expounded in the next clause "killing the enmity thereby". Christ dies that enmity might die.

This is Pauline theology¹¹² and very similar to Polycarp Phil 8:1. "He endured it all for us, so that we might live in union with him." (cf. Ignatius to the Smyrneans 1:2)

In the present context of flesh (15) and blood (13), the cross must mean Christ's death. It does not mean that through adversity, blessing has come, nor does it mean the shock effect of man's bloodthirstiness, which shocks men into repentance.¹¹³ It is something which God does in Christ, rather than what man does. It shows an historical event, and not Bultmann's idea of the cross as far removed from all temporal limitations, continuing to take place in any present moment, both in the proclaiming and in the sacraments.¹¹⁴

7.6 Ἀποκτείνας τὴν ἔχθραν

The word hostility has already occurred in verse 14 where we preferred to link it with λύσας . Thus we had a weaker expression than is found here.¹¹⁵ Hostility is now not simply removed, it is killed. "Killing" is appropriate, since it was achieved through death.¹¹⁶ It is not defeat but victory. "To men's eyes he was slain, but in truth he slew".¹¹⁷ The law, which almost killed Paul (Rom. 7:9, cf. 2 Cor. 3:6), has its effect killed. Paul often speaks of anything from the past as needing to be killed, e.g. the old man (Rom. 6:6, 8:10, Gal. 2:20). In Ephesians the whole past existence is one of death (2:1). The old nature has to be put off (4:22) and men must rise from the dead (5:14).

The aorist participle perhaps has its rare usage for subsequent action,¹¹⁸ "afterwards killing". It could be coincidental, "by reconciling them both, he killed the enmity". This makes good sense. The normal use of the aorist participle for antecedent action would suggest a translation "he killed the enmity between them and God reconciled both to each other". The word order, which places "killing the enmity" last, does not favour this, so we prefer the coincidental sense. The force of the aorist is now seen to be punctiliar, referring to Christ's once for all work.

The phrase gives the negative side of the previous "making peace" and compliments our opening words "for he is our peace".

What is this hostility? Is it the law?¹¹⁹ But law refers to the cause rather than to the enmity itself, as in 2:15b.¹²⁰ But is it hostility between Jew and Gentile as in that passage or does it now refer to enmity between man and God?¹²¹ We suggest that both can be included, but the emphasis is on the second.¹²² The aim of the apostle is not to explain the nature of the atonement in general as such but to show how Christ has reconciled with God the Jews and the Gentiles.¹²³

Was this killing of the hostility achieved directly or indirectly? Did Christ's work set out to kill the enmity, or was this the indirect result? If it refers to hostility between Jew and Gentile, /

Gentile, it is indirect. Either way it is a work of God, not man. He killed the enmity. Christ made an open show of the principalities and powers.¹²⁴ This end of enmity is the result of reconciliation¹²⁵ both collectively and individually. There are these two focii for Paul saw Christ's work as the hope of the world, yet men had to avail themselves of it individually. The purpose of Paul's ministry was to persuade men to be reconciled to God (2 Cor. 5:20). Ephesians has this wider view, but the community actually already reconciled is a comparatively small one, made up of a few individual Jews and Gentiles.

7.7 Ἐν αὐτῷ

This can refer to the cross, which is its immediate antecedent and mean "thereby",¹²⁶ or refer to the earthly body of Christ, given on the cross.¹²⁷ Since διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ links better with what precedes rather than with what follows the phrase (otherwise we would expect διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ to be at the end of v.16), Ἐν αὐτῷ is likely to mean "in himself". There is manuscript support for this, as in v.15.¹²⁸ This could have been an interpretation in the early church and it need not mean the same here. But such an interpretation agrees with v.17 that "he preached peace". Masson thinks it is reasonable that because Ἐν αὐτῷ parallels v.15, the author wishes to say that it is in him.¹²⁹

It is in the sense of agent, not local. A local sense would mean a battle within the Messiah, not an external foe. Christ like every Christian¹³⁰ did have to fight temptation. He had to fulfil the requirements of the law (Rom. 8:3-4) and overcome the natural human reaction of avoiding the cross (Mk. 14:36, John 12:27, Heb. 5:7). But as we saw in section 5.2 this is not the likely meaning in the context. "In him" shows that Jesus did it. He restored the reconciliation, not by using other people or other plans, but by himself (cf. 1 Pet. 2:24). He gave himself on the cross.

7.8/

7.8 Conclusion

Verse 16, with 15c, teaches the purpose of the activity described in 14-17. Until 15b it is simply factual, stating what Christ has done. 15c and 16 have the purpose. Thus verse 16 gives one aspect of this purpose, "That he might reconcile both" (Jew and Gentile). "In one body" parallels "one new man" rather than "in the flesh" and is a simple metaphor of unity. This is achieved "by the cross" which parallels "in his flesh". *Εν αὐτῷ* as in v.15 refers to Christ. He reconciles Jew and Gentile into one body through his work on the cross.

CHAPTER EIGHT. EPHESIANS 2:17What it appears to say.

He (that is the one who is our peace and who through the cross brought reconciliation) came and preached peace. He preached it to the far (understood as Gentiles) and to the near (Jews).

The sequence of events in this verse as well as the events themselves recall 1 Tim. 3:16, a similar passage in the disputed Pauline writings, where the preaching to the Gentiles is subsequent to his manifestation in the flesh, his justification in the spirit and his being seen of angels, but precedes his being received up into glory. In Ephesians, the preaching seems to be after his work is accomplished. This is the logical time for the preaching to be done, but how can Christ do this after his ascension? His actual preaching was prior to the cross and only to Jews (Mt. 10:6). Afterwards he appeared only to his closest disciples, who number a little more than five hundred (1 Cor. 15:6).

Verse 17 is clearly linked with the statement of v.14¹ but is it parallel to 15 and 16 or dependent upon them and therefore relating to a subsequent time? 15 and 16 have participial clauses. But our opening participle ἐλθὼν is closely linked with a main verb "he preached good tidings of peace" which suggests another virtual independent sentence, equivalent to the hebraic parataxis with "and".² We have the sentence "for he is our peace" as the basis, to which various explicatory clauses are added, before the present sentence, which is another statement about peace. Both statements are a natural unfolding of "but now" in v.13. Verse 17 returns to "the far and near" of v.13.

8.1 Καὶ ἐλθὼν

This has gnostic parallels where a redeemer comes from God in a disguised form, thus escaping recognition by the cosmic guards, and is able to communicate to men. The Acts of Thomas 9 (The Song of the Pearl), Thomas has been cast into prison and describes in a song the homecoming of the king's son, who had been sent from the world of light in the east to the land of darkness (Egypt) to fetch the pearl.

The Gospel of Philip, "Christ came ... he ransomed the strangers (53). "I have come to make (the things below) like the things above (and the things outside) like the things (inside). I have come to join them together at that place" (67). Christ came that he might set right again the separation which arose from the beginning and unite the two and give life to those who died in the separation and unite them (70). His body which came into being on that day came out of the bridal chamber (71)".

Valentinus is reported to have said, "Christ has gone up into the pleroma and was naturally reluctant to descend a second time, so he sent to her the Paraclete".³

Excerpta ex Theodotio 43:2-65:2 speaks of his ascent, e.g. 43:5.

"What does ascended mean but that he also descended? The one who descended into the lower parts of the earth is the same, who also ascended above the heavens. 36:1 says "since we were divided, Jesus was baptized that the undivided might be divided until he unites us with them in the pleroma, in order that we the many become one. May all of us be united with the one, which for our sakes was divided".

Gnostics would understand ascent as the ascent of the redeemer through the cosmic barrier, far above all principalities and powers. Schlief is attracted to this because (a) other interpretations of ascent are unsatisfactory and (b) this explains the whole ethos of Ephesians and of this passage in particular, where the wall is the cosmic barrier. The ascent of the redeemer is also his revelation and his return as shown in 4:9-10 and 1 Pet. 3:19, Ign Eph 19:1ff, Odes of Sol. 41:11ff, Asc. Is. 11, etc. In our passage the preaching is after the redeemer's descent and sojourn below and immediately subsequent to his ascent. This is the chronological sequence of 1:10 and 4:8 (cf. 1:20, 1) and of gnosticism.⁴

But the gnostic redeemer must also preach, when he descends from the world of light to communicate true knowledge or gnosis to the sparks of light sunk in sleep and to join them to himself.⁵ In New Testament theology the redeemer appears as a cosmic figure, the pre-existent divine being, the son of the father who came down from heavenly glory and wrested sovereignty from the spirit power to himself. The Pauline hymns like Phil. 2:6-11 reflect this.⁶

When/

When they are redeemed the preaching to men must be complete, unless some do not rise with him and are called at a later date. Hence Schlier has to say that the preaching of Eph. 2:17 in the original context was not to men but to principalities and powers.⁷ This is certainly different from the present context, which says the preaching is to the far and the near. Nevertheless the descent/ascent motif remains as strong support for the hypothesis of Christianity's dependence on gnosis.

Four answers can be given.

- a) The Gnostic evidence is late.
- b) It is generally overlooked that myths of descending/ascending redeemers are found elsewhere in the Mediterranean world prior to and contemporary with the origins of Christianity. Ovid tells of the visit of Jupiter and Mercury (cf. Acts 14:8-18) who lodge with poor Bacchus and Philemon. Tacitus speaks of Sarapis appearing to Soter and then ascending to heaven in a blaze of fire.⁸
- c) The coming of Christ is basically what the New Testament is all about. Hence it is a frequent idea, e.g. Lk. 19:10 and especially John (1:11, 3:13, 8:14, 13:3 and 16:28).
- d) Ascent and descent are common symbolism of Jewish origin, adopted both by Christianity and Gnosticism.⁹ The symbolism is found in Ps. 68:19, which Ephesians uses of an ascent after Christ's descent.¹⁰

Nevertheless ascent and descent concepts are not found in Eph. 2:14-16. They are imported from elsewhere.¹¹ The writer is just saying Christ came and provided reconciliation and preached it. 4:8 may refer to an ascent, but the most we can find in 2:17 is a descent.

Ἐλθῶν is a second aorist participle and we naturally think of the many others in the passage, ποιήσας, λύσας, καταργήσας, ἀποκτείνας. The punctiliar force suggests a specific coming at a certain time, rather than a general repetitive or continuous coming. The aorist suggests that his coming is antecedent to the main verb "preached". It should be understood as "and having come". This is remarkable¹² for the most likely meaning is that Jesus comes to earth to preach peace, yet the previous/

previous verse has already spoken of his death upon the cross. A similar view is ascribed to Paul in Acts 26:23, when it explicitly says that after Christ's suffering and resurrection from the dead, he would preach both to the people and to the Gentiles.¹³ We must not say that "and coming" is superfluous.¹⁴ To ignore the words would be inaccurate and negligent exegesis, especially since they cause the real difficulty here. It is necessary therefore to answer this question.

When did Christ come and preach?

8.1.1 Before his incarnation?

This has support from John 8:56 and 1 Cor. 10:4¹⁵ and possibly from 1 Pet. 3:19. The latter could refer to preaching by Christ to men in the days of Noah, who are now dead and in prison. But it is better understood as preaching by Christ, after his death or after his resurrection¹⁶ to fallen angels. A pre-incarnation preaching does not fit in with Ephesian thought. There was no peace before Christ's reconciling work on the cross.

8.1.2 During his earthly ministry?

Harless thinks it must be this, or we would find in the text "having caused to preach". The aorist tense supports it and Christ was regarded as a preacher.¹⁷ But it is difficult, since our passage appears to refer to a time subsequent to Christ's death. His earthly ministry moreover was mainly to the Jews, who are only one of the parties that 2:14-17 is concerned about.¹⁸ There were however the incidents involving the Samaritans and the Syrophoenician woman, the tax collectors and sinners who by Jewish reckoning were far off. The prodigal returned from the far country. Christ believed he was called to preach and in Lk. 4:17f he applied Is. 61:1-2 to himself and his preaching of liberty and freedom.¹⁹ The universal message is ascribed to Jesus in John 1:29, 3:16, 4:42, 10:16, 12:32 and Matt. 28:18-20. The evidence however is unanimous that although he may have intended his followers to preach the message worldwide, he himself kept to Jews.

Ephesians/

Ephesians moreover does not show much interest in the earthly life of Jesus apart from his death (5:2) preceding his exaltation. This would be overcome if we saw it not so much his incarnation, but his public entrance into the world as the great teacher and source of divine light (John 12:46).²⁰ This still however has the difficulty that it precedes the cross. Perhaps we should not expect the author to have a scrupulous respect for chronological order.²¹ This may seem to be contradicted by the author's great contrast between the past and the present. However his "present" is timeless. The aorist participle "coming" can hardly precede the previous aorist participle "killing" and at the most must be coincidental. It is more likely to be subsequent.

8.1.3 After his resurrection?

Three factors support this interpretation.

- a) The preaching is by Jesus personally.
- b) It is after his death.²²
- c) The aorist suggests it refers to a period now closed which would be the time of the resurrection appearances.²³

The gospels certainly depict Jesus as preaching a message of peace after his death, but it was only to the very near. Nevertheless traditionally he commissioned the apostles to a worldwide ministry (Mt. 28:19) and gave them his authority in this message (John 20: 21-23).²⁴

ἔλθῶν may refer to his drawing near to those whom he addresses rather than emphasizing his coming death or from his descent into hell.

The three views outlined above, assume the preaching must be done by Jesus personally. When combined they refer to the entire life of Jesus.²⁵

8.1.4 Preaching in the Holy Spirit.²⁶

This gives special significance to the ἔλθῶν since the Spirit's coming is a real one. He is sent (John 14:26) and in a real sense Christ comes in him (14:18, 26, 15:26, 16:14, 15). The Spirit came/

came not only at Pentecost causing Peter to preach, but comes to the individual concerned (Gal. 3:2, Eph. 1:13, cf. Acts 2:38).²⁷ The meaning is therefore consistent, but is in itself not sufficiently clear to fully explain our passage.

8.1.5 The preaching of the apostles.

This view is closely linked with 8.1.4, so presumably most who hold this view would subscribe to that also, although emphasizing in one case the human aspect and in the other case the divine agency.

The apostles' preaching is subsequent to the cross and is what the early church was doing in Christ's name to Jew and Gentile. The link between Christ and the apostles in preaching is shown in Lk. 10:16, "he who hears you, hears me" (cf. Mt. 10:40, 41). The disciples preached peace in Mt. 10:13-14. Their message has the same binding authority (Mt. 16:19).²⁸

8.1.6 A combination of the above views.²⁹

This seems to be the best conclusion and fits in with Ephesian eschatology which combines Christ's past, present and future activity.³⁰ According to the gospel tradition, the word "coming" was employed by Jesus of his ministry as a totality in Mt. 5:17, 9:13, 10:34, 20:28, Lk. 19:10. This links well with the Old Testament and the proclamation of peace by the prophets. Israel and the new people of God spread this news. Through Christ's cross, peace was made and he through his church takes out the message of reconciliation and peace to the world.³¹ The event of his coming is not just his birth, but his appearance, his epiphany.³² This sense of coming is close to Johannine language.

Some commentators have gone astray because they have insisted the words coming and preaching must be literal, referring to Christ himself personally, whereas the word preaching probably only occurs because of the quotation from Is. 57:19³³ and its connection with 52:7. 'ΕΛΘΩν need not be taken in specific chronological sequence, since Ephesians has the work of Christ in a timeless present. ^ε

8.2 Εὐαγγελίσατο εἰρήνην

Christ is not only "our peace" and the one who procures it. He preaches it also. "The subjective application of the benefits of Christ's purchase are not left to chance". It is good news (εὐαγγελίσομαι) not just proclamation (κηρύσσω).

The second of the two references to peace is sometimes omitted, e.g. by the Syriac and the text used by Marcion and Origen. But both references are found in what are usually regarded as the more important Greek manuscripts. Perhaps the omission is due to a conformation of the text to the LXX, where a translator thought a repetition was futile. But one word only could suggest that the peace is undivided. Those far and near share the same peace.³⁴ Our author probably intended by the repetition of the word, not simply to copy Isaiah and have two references, but to insist on the fact that Christ has announced the same peace to Jew and to Gentile.³⁵ Its repetition may be rhetorical.³⁶ It is peace in two senses, between Jew and Gentile and towards God. Jew and Gentile can find peace with God through Jesus Christ and thereby find peace with one another. Chrysostom thought it was simply towards God, but the other aspect of peace certainly results from it. Jesus had the right to preach peace, since he procured it.³⁷

8.3 Ἔρην τοῖς μακρὰν καὶ εἰρήνην τοῖς ἐγγύς

The far are placed first³⁸ as in the Nunc Dimittis (Lk. 2:32). That peace is preached to the far is the surprising thing and has already been stressed by the author. He therefore places "far" first. The Jews were near, because they previously had all the advantages (Rom. 9:4, 5). Now unless they draw near in Christ they will belong to the far.

Far is not only geographical, circumstantial and dispensational, but now has also a moral significance because of sin. To be either near or far in the traditional sense is equally bad.³⁹

Whereas according to v.13 the far have become near, v.17 clearly assumes that in reality both were far away.⁴⁰

Ἔρην is in apposition to μακρὰν and refers to the Gentiles. It is unlikely to refer to ἐγγύς as well. If that were intended, /

intended, it would be repeated in the same way that the word peace is repeated.

As we saw (section 313) Is. 57:19 is in mind. There is a clear connection of vv. 17 and 13 with that passage, which in the LXX is *εἰρήνην ἐπ'εἰρήνην τοῖς μακρὰν καὶ τοῖς ἐγγύς οὖσιν καὶ*
*εἶπεν κύριος ἰάσθαι αὐτούς.*⁴¹

The author used *μακρὰν* as a result of his general Jewish knowledge for -

- a) he cites the Old Testament in v.17 and
- b) "far" is a frequent Old Testament metaphor which could be used, geographically or metaphorically.

Proximity to Jerusalem meant proximity to God (Ps. 121). In the new dispensation geographical location (John 4:23, 4) or spiritual privilege are no longer relevant and possible. Ephesians would agree with John's Gospel in this respect.

Geographically the Jews of the Dispersion were far away, so in the Old Testament it is the context which decides whether "far" refers to Gentiles (Deut. 13:7, Is. 33:13, 49:1) or to Jews (Is. 43:6, 60:4, Ezek. 11:16, Joel 3:6, Zech. 6:15, Est. 9:20, Dan. 9:7). Metaphorically it can refer to Jews of the Exile or Dispersion (Is. 49:12, 60:4, 9, Joel 3:6) or to Gentiles (Deut. 13:7, Is. 33:13, 49:1, 19) or to the wicked (Ps. 73:27, 119:150, 155, Prov. 15:29, Is. 46:12), who can presumably be Jews.

"Near" was the privileged position of the Jew (Ps. 148:14, Deut. 4:7) but the term can be used in a neutral sense (Ps. 145:18, 22:11) of the attitude of mind. But it is still those who would ascend the hill of the Lord and stand in his holy place. The man of a broken and contrite heart would logically seek the God of Israel and therefore obey his law.

The phrase "far and near" was familiar to the Rabbis.⁴² The reference to Isaiah shows that at least for this verse there is no need to have recourse to Greek religion for the source of the thought.

Other/

Other passages could also be in mind, e.g. Is. 49:12, which speaks of folk coming from far, and 52:7, which is part of the unit 7-10 and describes the return of Yahweh to Zion and the re-establishment of his reign over the holy city. It is similar to 40:9-11, for both passages tell of the liberation from Babylon and the return from exile. This return is depicted as a victory over Pharaoh (51:9-11). This victory and liberation is the good news which the messenger announces to Jerusalem in Is. 52:7. "How beautiful" is best translated as "how welcome".⁴³ The one who brings the good tidings is a military runner, a watchman whose function (see Is. 40:9) is like a watchman to report the approach of troops, or a military runner sent ahead to announce their arrival (1 Sam. 31:9, 2 Sam. 18:10-21). The significance lies in his function rather than in his identity.⁴⁴ The announcer's feet are mentioned, since it is characteristic of Hebrew to concentrate on the significant part of the body instead of mentioning the person as a whole.⁴⁵ The announcer proclaims peace, that all is well.⁴⁶ He publishes salvation that is victory.

Is. 54:10 says that although mountains and hills be removed, the Lord's covenant of peace will not depart from his people. This imagery would be suggested by Ps. 114, where mountains were removed to provide a path through the wilderness, and Gen. 7:19-20 where the mountains disappeared. God's promise to Noah is an everlasting covenant, not only promising survival, but his eternal goodness to his people as well.⁴⁷

Is. 57:19 is in the part of Isaiah known by us as Trito-Isaiah referring to the time after 538, either before or after Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi. The people need to be encouraged to return to Palestine as well as incentive given to those who have already returned. The writer of Ephesians may not have had such a clear picture of its historical context, since he would understand Isaiah of Jerusalem as speaking, albeit in prophecy.

The passage 56:9-59:21 has been called "the rekindling of the civic conscience"⁴⁸ and 57:14-20 "the way of humble piety".⁴⁹ 57:19 can be translated as "for his mourners I create the fruit of the lips, peace, peace to the far and to the near says Yahweh and I heal him, but the wicked are like the tossing sea, when it cannot come to rest.

Its/

Its waters toss up mire and dirt."⁵⁰ 17a reverts to the motif of 54:7f where God is hidden from the sufferer. Now he proposes to heal and give rest.⁵¹ Westermann thinks 17b is awkward after 17a, (God is angry, yet in the present text after they still further backslide, he is merciful) and that 18b links with 17a.

Ephesians would assume the unity of Isaiah and regard this passage as a prophecy of the return from exile. The "far" in v.19 means those who are far away in the dispersion rather than those who are estranged from God among the chosen people.⁵²

8.3.1 How would far and near be understood by Jews?

The passage is quoted by Rabbis in *b. Berakoth* 34b and 55b. But in the former the emphasis is on the second part of the verse (the fruit of our lips) and in the second it is one of three texts about peace, one should repeat after a dream. *b. Sanhedrin* 99a (R. Abbahu) quotes Is. 57:19 and sees the problem that a repentant sinner is placed first before the completely righteous, "in the place where penitents stand, even the wholly righteous cannot stand", as it says "peace ... far ... near, to him that was far first and then to him that is near". It mentions how R. Johanan overcame the difficulty by taking "far" as meaning one who has always been far from transgression and "near" as referring to one who was once near to transgression and now has gone far from it.

The terms "near" and "far" are familiar to the Rabbis. J.J. Wettstein found more than a dozen rabbinic passages which cite "near and far" like 13 and 17.⁵³ The Pharisees had proselytizing concerns (Mt. 23:15) but converts had to become Jews. Hillel used to say (*M. Aboth* 1) "be thou of the disciples of Aaron loving peace and pursuing, be thou one who loveth (one's fellow) creatures and bringeth them nigh unto the Torah". The rabbinical background of Paul would directly (or indirectly if Ephesians is a pseudonymous writing) colour the interpretation of Is. 57, but these comments are completely inward looking and far from the universal breadth of Ephesians.⁵⁴

8.3.2/

8.3.2 How understood by the Gnostics.

Near and far were terms used by Gnostics for pneumatics and psychics.⁵⁵ Origen, when commenting on Romans 4, seems to be influenced by Gnosticism when he interprets Ephesians in a cosmic manner. He takes the "near and far" in 13 and 17 as parallel to Col. 1:20 "things on earth and in heaven". Hence superior powers are the near and men the far. Hostility was the middle wall of separation preventing the nature of men from being capable of the blessedness of the superior beings. The superior beings serve God according to the true spiritual law, which is identical with the "dogmata" by which Christ abrogates the law of commandments. When the middle wall is broken, the higher spiritual law which had previously been limited to the superior powers becomes available to men. Although this is similar to gnostic thought, it differs in not positing a fundamental division of mankind. The wall is broken down for all men, not just for some.

We have a similar phrase to "far and near" which is probably independent of Ephesians and Paul in The Mandaean Liturgy 223f "a poor man, I am, who out of the fruit, a foreigner who comes from far".

8.3.3 How understood by the writer.

Since it is a quotation we must briefly consider how scripture is quoted in the Pauline writings. Paul cites the Old Testament accurately fifty-three times plus others of a freer nature.⁵⁶ Most quotations are from the LXX with only four from the Hebrew. In many of the general citations he deviates from both the Hebrew and the LXX. His "exegesis was not just an adoption of current traditions, but reveals a vitality and understanding totally foreign to rabbinical literature".⁵⁷

Ephesians has several quotations from the LXX and in the main they keep fairly close to existing editions of that version, e.g. 1:20 (Ps. 110:1) changes the verb to a participle and the preposition becomes $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$. 1:22 (Ps. 8:6) changes from $\acute{\upsilon}\nu\kappa\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\tau\hat{\omega}\nu$ to $\acute{\upsilon}\nu\acute{\omicron}$. 4:8 citing Ps. 68:18 has "given" for "received" and $\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma$ for $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$. 4:25 (Zech. 8:16) has $\mu\epsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}$ for $\pi\rho\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$. 4:26 is exact and 5:31 (Gen. 2:24)/

(Gen. 2:24) is identical after *ἐνεκεν*. 6:2 (Ex. 20:12) is exact and so is 6:3, except the parallel verse Deut. 5:16 adds *γένη* after "live long". 6:14, 15 (Is. 11:5 and 59:17) is not exact, but is hardly claiming to be a quotation. It is more like application. The meaning in 1:20 is essentially the same as in the Old Testament and it is essentially the same in 1:22 and 4:25, although used to illustrate what is new. 5:31 and 6:2 and 3 have the same meaning. Ephesians 2:17 departs from both the Hebrew and the LXX in separating the two consecutive references to peace. The meaning is also changed, but it is still closer to the text than the gnostic interpretation.⁵⁸

The writer is careful in using the Old Testament and does not take a passage out of its context. He has not really changed the meaning of Is. 57:19.⁵⁹ It is a natural way for a Christian to interpret the passage in the light of the Christ-event, especially one like Paul. We have scriptural exegesis by a Christian. The Messiah is for the world instead of simply for the Jews. This widens the meaning to include not only the geographically distant Jews but the Gentile also.⁶⁰

8.4 Conclusion

The Isaianic passage 57:19-21 ends with peace which is very significant. "There is no peace for the wicked". Ephesians says, in contrast, that for those without God "Christ is our peace". Either the term "peace" first reminded the author of Is. 57:19 and then of "the far and near", or the idea of "far and near" reminded him of Is. 57:10, which suggested the word peace. The latter seems more likely, as far and near fit naturally in the context. It is peace which is the new idea and this comes from the Isaianic quotation.

Schlatter thinks Paul has Isaiah in mind as far back as 57:13, where the promise is given that whosoever takes refuge in God shall possess and inherit the land. Peace in Is. 57:19 is stressed by being mentioned twice, which Delitzsch took as repetition "let every enduring and perfect peace (as in 26:3) become the portion of those of my people, who are scattered far and near" (43:5-7 and 49:12).⁶¹

It is the wicked who are the obstruction of v.18. Yahweh's love for his people has overcome this, but clearly this does not mean that the sinful element itself is to share in this blessing. The verse suggests they cannot do so by their own nature. The wicked are tossed (cf. Eph. 4:14 "tossed to and fro by every wind of doctrine") (Heb. *garash* "drive out, cast out, thrust out") (Lev. 21:7 of a divorced woman) as the Nile is tossed (Amos 8:8, Ex. 23:28). The verb is used in Ex. 10:11 of Moses and Aaron being dismissed from Pharaoh's presence. Frail vessels and no other means of transport across oceans in those days made the sea an obvious metaphor to use (Ps. 107:23-30). Man because of his sin is restless, never satisfied, as unstable as the waves of the sea (James 1:6).

There is a use of Isaiah in Eph. 2:14-17, but we need not go as far as Kirby, who actually sees not only a Midrash on the Isaianic passage but links with Christian baptism and Pentecost.⁶² Less fanciful is P. Stuhlmacher who, as we have seen, finds a Christological exegesis of various passages from Isaiah, 9:5, 52:7, 57:19.⁶³

He expounds Eph. 2:14ff, not as a distinct entity but within the framework of 11-22, which deals with the themes of peace and reconciliation. Is. 57:19 is clearly used. What was promised, God has made a reality through the death of Christ. Jewish exegesis linked Is. 52:7 and 9:5ff to the Messiah.⁶⁴ In Is. 9:5 the Messiah is called *ἄγγελος* which links with *εὐαγγελίσω* in Eph. 2:17. Moreover Is. 9:5, 6 has three references to peace. The writer is not using a speculative cosmic idea but rather the promise of scripture and the Pauline doctrine of reconciliation.

Certainly the author of Ephesians is fond of Isaiah and the following passages in Ephesians recall that book: 1:4 (44:1), 1:7 (42:22), 1:9 (45:4), 1:18 (44:18), 2:12 (55:5), 2:13 (46:12, 13, 60:4), 2:14 (42:13, 48:18, 22, 53:5, 57:14, 58:12, 59:8, 62:10), 2:15 (42:9, 43:19), 2:17 (41:27, 52:7, 54:10, 12, 57:2, 19, 21, 60:4, 61:1, 66:12), 3:6 (42:6, 43:5, 44:21, 54:3, 59:19, 60:3, 62:2). Some of these are only faint allusions, but Is. 48:22, 52:7, 57:14, 19, 21, 58:12, 60:4, 61:1 and 62:10 seem to have been used.⁶⁵

2:17 tells us that Jesus came and preached peace to the far and to the near. The far are placed first and the preaching to them of the fact of Christ's reconciling work. The near are mentioned. These are the Jews to whom Christ literally came and preached. But since the preaching is to the far as well, the preaching of Paul and the apostles is included. These also preached to the Jews, as *did* the reading of the law itself (Acts 13:27). The Gentiles are now treated like the Jews of the dispersion. They can come because the barrier has been removed.

8.5 The remainder of the chapter.

Verse 18 explains further why there is peace for those far and near. It is because⁶⁶ both have access⁶⁷ in one Spirit to the Father. Spirit seems at first to be parallel to "in one body" and therefore not a reference to the Holy Spirit.⁶⁸ But can we really say that Jews and Gentiles with Christ are in one spirit? We have already shown one body is not parallel to flesh, so the meaning cannot be "reconciled by one spirit". Christ is the agent and the realm Jew and Gentile have entered is that of the Spirit (Rom. 5:2, Eph. 3:12). They are shown how near they have come to God. This is the great climax. Ἐσόμεν is the present tense, showing the abiding result.⁶⁹

Verses 14-17 are sometimes seen as introduced and concluded with two verses which speak about worship. In support of the suggestion, it can be shown that "access" and "drawing near" can have cultic connections. "Drawing near" usually has a legal barrier in mind, but is linked with sacrifices in Ex. 29:10, Lev. 1:3, 3:3, 4:17, 7:6. The verb "eggizw" has a technical sense in Ex. 3:5, Lev. 21:21, Ez. 40:46. In Qumran, "Qarab" is used in the sense of offering a sacrifice (cf. IQS 8:9) with the opposite word "rahaq" signifying the admission and exclusion respectively of the candidates in the community (IQS 6:16-22, 7:21, 8:18, 9:15-16) to the rites of purification and the sacred banquet (IQS 6:16-22).⁷⁰ Despite this evidence it still appears to be reading into Ephesians the concepts of Hebrews. Vv. 14-17 may have been used in a service of worship, but it is difficult to see how it presents the work of Christ as worship. Access is stressed, rather as the consequence of the preaching of peace,⁷¹ the contrast of the distance from God in v. 13.

There/

There is not enough evidence therefore for the assertion that 14-17 ascribe the making of peace as an act of worship, in which Christ is High Priest and victim.⁷² Christ dies and the sacrificial victim may be in mind, but he is not depicted as the High Priest.

Verse 18 is the end of the Christological section 14-18 and returns to the present tense after the aorists of 14-17. It has the two central thoughts of the passage, peace with God the Father⁷³ and mutual union between Gentiles and Jews ("both in one spirit").⁷⁴ Christ's death has opened access to the city of the saints and the house of God, to the holy temple and the divine dwelling.⁷⁵

Verse 19 begins a new paragraph, but it is not necessary to say that it is Baptismal Song with three strophes.⁷⁶ Nauck suggests it, because of the participial style in 20, 21a and verbs like "become near", "grow" (cf. 1 Pet. 2:2, 1 Cor. 3:6, Col. 1:10) "build" (1 Pet. 2:5) *τιθέναι*, etc. Many of the arguments are based on the hypothesis that other passages are baptismal hymns as well. It seems integral to Ephesians 2 because of "spirit" in 18 and 22. *Ἄρα* is often found not introducing a liturgical passage (cf. Rom. 8:12, 9:16, Gal. 6:10, etc.). Here it has links with 11-18, especially v.12 "at that time". Verse 19 is rather the transition from the Christological section to the writer's comments on his statement about Christ's action.

8.5.1 Strangers and sojourners.

The significance of verse 19 is that Gentiles are no longer the *ξένοι* and *πάροικοι*. These two terms are not likely to refer to two distinct groups of Gentiles.⁷⁷ We have a further example of the author emphasizing a point by using two similar words. These two terms describe the position negatively. This is followed by the positive that Gentiles are fellow-citizens of the saints (i.e. Jews, cf. the commonwealth of Israel 2:12) and household of God.⁷⁸ The Jews already recognised proselytes from paganism and God-fearers. The latter would include many men who did not take the final step of circumcision.

201.

The word ξένος (and ἑλλότριος cf. Eph. 2:12) is used from Mycenaean times onwards for a guest and the friendly stranger.⁷⁹ In the LXX it is used for any foreigner (Ruth 2:10 = יִתְּיָדָי) and occurs fourteen times in the New Testament with the meaning alien (2:12) or stranger (Mt. 25:35).

Πάροικος is παρά plus οἶκος and was originally an adjective, which was later used as a noun. The corresponding verb παροικέω means to "live beside". The Gentiles were those who lived like strangers beside the Jews. In a new sense, Christians are now πάροικοι upon earth, but they are citizens of heaven (cf. Phil. 3:20,⁸⁰ Gal. 4:26, Heb. 11:15f, 12:22ff, 13:14).

Πάροικος (also προσήλυτος) is used in the LXX for גֵר in the sense of a resident alien, and for יִשְׂרָאֵל.⁸¹

גֵר which is translated by πάροικος, προσήλυτος and ξένος is a non-Israelite who has settled in the land and is distinguished from the temporary stranger (יִתְּיָדָי = ξένος). In later Old Testament times, he appears to be a convert. He would gradually be drawn into Israelite life and would be expected to observe the sabbath, keep sacrifices and festivals, and, if circumcised, the passover. These conditions were logical, when an intensive missionary movement for proselytizing began in intertestamental times.⁸² In Palestinian Judaism "ger" always referred to pagans who had been converted to Judaism.⁸³ R Eliezer b Hyrcanus (A.D. 80-120) was suspicious of all proselytes.⁸⁴ But Hillel (A.D. 10-20) said (Maboth 1:12) "Be one of the disciples of Aaron, a lover of peace, following after peace, loving mankind and drawing them to the law". Philo (Ex 11:2 on 22:21) says the sojourner is better than the average foreigner or he would not be here. J.E. Crouch shows how a sojourner or a "ger" was to be treated like a Jew and afforded the same legal rights as his Hebrew neighbours (Lev. 19: 33f, 24:22, Num. 35:15, cf. Ezek. 47:22). In time a distinction came to be made between the stranger living in Palestine יִשְׂרָאֵל גֵר and the sojourner who took over the Jewish laws רִבְרִי גֵר.⁸⁵ Crouch points out that after the exile the older terminology lost its significance when most Jews were sojourners themselves in strange lands. But the terms were used in the rabbinic literature to describe the various degrees of adherence to the Jewish/

Jewish religion. A full proselyte was a "nebuzaradan", whereas one who accepted in part was known as "naaman". The most prevalent term for these partial adherents became "god-fearers". Crouch shows the difficulty of tracing the origin of the separation of adherents into three distinct groups, Jews, proselytes and god-fearers, as is found in the New Testament.⁸⁶

There is therefore a rich Old Testament and Jewish background for the terminology concerning the stranger who comes to belong to the society around him.

8.5.2 20-22

In 20-22 a rapid change of metaphor takes place from anatomy to social standing, politics and a building⁸⁷ to a new temple.⁸⁸

Shepherd of Hermas 9 has several parallels to the passage. Stones in the superstructure, brought from twelve different mountains, represent believers from all nations, who are united in the church (Sim 9:16-17) forming one body (9:13, 5 and 7, 17:5, 18:3 and 4) whose foundations are apostles and prophets. Eph. 2:20-22 uses eight terms connected with building.⁸⁹

It is only incidental that the apostles were Jews. They are foundation members, not because of race, but because they saw the Lord and were leading members of the church at the beginning. The prophets in 2:20 are therefore more likely to be New Testament prophets, since, if it were a reference to Old Testament Jewish prophets following a reference to Christian prophets, it would be out of place and in the reverse order chronologically. An argument in favour of Jewish prophets which is not sufficient is that we are built upon the prophets who predicted such things as Is. 57:19 does.⁹⁰

Christ is the cornerstone (whether at the foundation as most believe or the keystone).⁹¹ The keystone seems apt and links with the idea of head in contrast to the body below. But when talking of the foundation, the keystone and the idea of completion is out of place.⁹² Cornerstone agrees with the normal New Testament use of this "proof text".⁹³

The/

The term "build a house" is in Ruth 4:11, Jer. 24:6, 31:4, 42:10, cf. 1:10 and 31:28). In later Jewish literature the term "to build" has cosmic connotations and alludes to the heavenly as well as the earthly Jerusalem and its temple. Ephesians is prompted by the world-shrine of Isaiah and Zechariah and the intertestamental writers, particularly Enoch 90:29-34, in which the Lord provides a new temple to house both Jews and Gentiles.⁹⁴

Here it is not a future building (as in 1 Cor. 3:16, 2 Cor. 5:2) but the present place of God's dwelling. It is not the gnostic unearthly heavenly building, but the earthly church with the foundation of the apostles and prophets.⁹⁵ The temple is now a church (John 2:13-22, 1 Peter 2:5, 1 Cor. 6:19-20, Rev. 21:1ff). This idea of corporate unity as a temple has an antecedent in Qumran which looked upon itself as a living temple in which the general membership constituted the Holy Place and the inner council the Holy of Holies (IQS 11:8). Qumran also has it in an eschatological sense. In the end times, it will be a holy house for Israel (IQS 8:5ff).⁹⁶ It grows into a holy shrine, a temple with no barrier.

There are similarities in Eph. 2:20 to 1 Pet. 2:5f which also discusses the cornerstone, and is therefore an argument for a similar date and milieu for the two letters and for the existence of Testimonies in the early church. In Zech. 6:13, the branch (a messiah-like figure) builds the temple of the Lord.⁹⁷

The building "grows". By this phrase the author links the metaphors of body and building.⁹⁸ Believers share in this growth (2:22) which is a Pauline idea (Col. 1:10, 2 Cor. 10:15).⁹⁹ They grow up in Christ for which they are equipped by the Spirit. The church exists in the spirit and as such is living and growing. It is a timeless church. Because of the Spirit, they are not stones, but people. Because of the Spirit, the building does not simply get bigger, it grows.¹⁰⁰ Barrier and hostility which divide have been removed and can no longer hinder this work.

CHAPTER NINE. FINDINGS OF THE EXEGESIS.

9.1 Conclusion.

The passage is not a hymn but has some hymnic characteristics arising from the writer's style and his use of Is. 57:19 and Col. 1:20-22 (Section 3.2.8). He dwells on Isaiah's theme of peace to near and far.

An expanded paraphrase would run as follows. "For Christ himself (see Sections 4.1 and 4.1.1) and no other is our (Jew and Gentile, 4.1.2) peace (Isaianic passages are in mind, 4.2.3.5.4) who has made both Jew and Gentile one, and broken down the middle wall (probably the temple barrier 4.4.3.1) which was the source of the hostility (5.1) and annulled through his flesh (i.e. his death 5.2) the divisive effects of the law (5.5) with its commandments, consisting of regulations. His purpose was to create by himself (6.3 *ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ* is parallel to *ἐν αὐτῷ* in v.15) one new man from the two groups of Jew and Gentile (6.1) a new creation (6.2) thus making peace. And to reconcile both (not Jews only) of them in one body (i.e. the church 7.3) unto God through the cross, killing by himself (i.e. Christ as agent (7.7)) the hostility that existed, not simply between Jew and Gentile but also between them both and God. Jesus came and preached (in his ministry and through the apostles and prophets (8.1.6) who were foundation church members) peace to you who were far away as well as to the Jews". The promise of Is. 57:19 has been fulfilled in a deeper way in the experience of the writer and his readers.

Ephesians 2:14-17 speaks of Christ as the Peacemaker, who brings together different groups by his work of reconciliation. We have identified these groups, not as the spiritual world above and the material world below but as Jew and Gentile. We have not found the former type of group in older material which the author uses.

If Ephesians is a letter, 2:14-17 is more unusual than it would be in a homily (see Section 2.2.2). But despite Ephesians being different from other letters, there is no better classification for it.

The theme of Ephesians is the eternal purpose of God for the unity of mankind or the unity of the church and 2:14-17 shows that his readers have/

have a share in that purpose, exemplified by the fact that Gentile and Jew have become one. The verses deal with one aspect of the total cosmic reconciliation which we find in Colossians. The theme is in tune with Ephesians as a whole, although more Christological and ecclesiological.

Our study of the particular passage in which we are interested has taught us nothing more about the precise purpose of the letter, or to be dogmatic on any of the suggestions discussed in 2.2.3.

14-17 provides an example of inclusio, where words (*πακρὰν* and *ἔγγυς* v.13) are elaborated upon, before being cited again (in v.17). The passage shows the negative aspect of Christ's work (14-15) and then the positive (15b-17).

There is a clear link with Col. 1:20-22 (not Col. 1:15-20 as usually stated). Eph. 2:14-17 may appear to have been based on an underlying hymn, but an actual hymn is difficult to isolate as shown in the many varied suggestions put forward by scholars.

Verse 13 sets the scene for the passage by quoting Is. 57, which in turn suggests the description of Christ as "our peace". The use of Isaiah (including chapters 9 and 57) explains the reference to peace better than other Old Testament examples such as Melchizedek and Solomon.

Ἐπιήνη is unlikely to mean something so specific as Peace Offering (4.2.2.1) or be a contrast to the Holy War (4.2.3.5.3). The general Old Testament concept of Shalom and the political climate of "Pax Romana" would be in the mind of writer and reader. Christ brings the end time salvation.

The unusual neuter words *ἀμφότερα* and *ἐν* can be more easily understood without a gnostic explanation. Despite difficulties the "middle wall" is best seen as a barrier in the temple. Readers who were not Jews would appreciate this from barriers in other temples and from their reading of the Old Testament (Ex. 12:43, Num. 1:51, Neh. 13:1-3, but cf. 1 Kings 8:41-43). A cosmic barrier is possible, but *μεσότοιχον* is never used of it. A barrier derived from gnostic concepts is made unlikely by the lateness of the sources. The law was certainly a barrier as our passage states, /

states, but there seems to have been an actual illustration in mind, such as that of the temple wall. It could be another barrier or simply a metaphorical use of wall.

The middle wall clearly illustrates the barrier which was caused by the law. The aorist λύσας shows Christ's decisive action in removing it. Reference is also made to hostility and there is ample evidence of how this was caused by the law. Christ removed this hostility by his flesh, that is through his death rather than by his incarnation or whole life. There is no reference to an opposition which Christ had to face from his own flesh. Since it refers to the human flesh of Christ, the theological significance of the word flesh is not in mind, as it is for example in Romans 8.

The law is referred to by several terms νόμος, ἐντολή, δόγμα (Ephesians has a habit of using groups of similar words) and the word δόγμασι would seem to suggest its divisive aspect between Jews and Gentiles. Ἐν δόγμασι is not a reference to the law of commandments being removed by the new decrees of Christ. The writer has high regard for the law of God, but sees its divisive effects, as an exclusive Jewish possession, have now been removed. The barrier, which the law caused to be erected, is taken away.

The punctuation of vv. 15, 16 with a comma after ἔχθραν ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ is to be preferred. "In his flesh he has broken down the dividing fence, the hostility by annulling the law with its rules and regulations".

After negative statements in 2:14b and 15a, there are two positive ones which form a couplet, (a) That he might create in him, the two in one new man making peace, (b) That he might reconcile both to God in one body, killing the enmity by himself (or by it, i.e. the cross).

The one new man belongs to Christ, but is not Christ himself, since he creates the new man. The author does not write THE new man. It shows the church as personal, as an individual, a fullgrown man (4:13). It is one body, one bride (chapter 5). The metaphor of "body" is used to describe this unity, but again it does not say "The Body of Christ" as is taught elsewhere in Ephesians (4:12) and Paul. Reconciliation brings this close unity of Christians to each other.

We now summarize what we have found in answer to the questions raised in section 1.2.

9.2 Is there an underlying hymn?

Although such a hymn is detected by Schlier, Gnllka and others, we find the evidence unconvincing. It has been found impossible to reconstruct the hymn satisfactorily, either as a distinct work or as an additional verse of the hymn in Col. 1:15-20. Connections of the passage with Colossians 1:20-22 are more obvious and the apparent hymnic style of Eph. 2:14-17 can be explained by the author having Col. 1:20-21 in mind and using Isaiah. The former of these passages speaks of peace and reconciliation, the latter of "far and near".

9.3 The background of the passage.

If Eph. 2:14-17 has no hymnic origin, then a gnostic background is unlikely. Any resemblances to gnosticism would be derived indirectly from Colossians. But since all that can be said at the very most is that Colossians refutes a proto-gnostic heresy then the connection of Eph. 2:14-17 with gnosis is very limited indeed. The background of the passage is primarily Jewish, since the author uses Colossians and the Old Testament, especially Isaiah.

The passage is closer to Old Testament and Jewish methods of interpretation than it is to gnostic passages, which appear to develop the ideas of Ephesians and other New Testament books. Stuhlmacher has shown how Eph. 2:13-17 is a Christological exegesis of Is. 9:5, 52:7 and 57:19 in the framework of Eph. 2:11-22. 13 and 17 deal with Is. 57:19, 14 with Is. 9:5 and 17 with 52:7. He feels that Gnllka and others who see a hymn have not really recognized the exegetical unity of the passage.¹

The peace announced for the far and near in Is. 57:19 is realised through the Prince of Peace. If Paul were the author then I suggest that he, being convinced he was called to preach to the Gentiles, found Isaiah the most congenial and natural book to use and this stimulated his thinking and his theology. In Ephesians he does not use the rabbinical method so precisely as is sometimes suggested (e.g. Kirby). He certainly does not use it in the way that John 6:33-58 and Gal. 3:7-18 do. He comes closer to rabbinical method in/

in Eph. 4:8.²

Jewish exegesis of the time of Jesus had five broad categories, Targum, Midrash, Pesher, Typology and Allegory.³ Midrash aimed to expound a passage and in making it relevant to the present, concerned itself not simply with the obvious meaning but with the inner or hidden meanings. Pesher means interpretation and is the word used thirty times in the Aramaic portion of Daniel (and also in the Dead Sea Scrolls).⁴ It is a more precise form of midrash, although not a separate distinction. For the use of this method of interpretation the revelatory expertise of a Daniel or the Qumran teacher would be needed. Sometimes as in Eph. 4:8 and Gal. 3:11 the interpretation is in the emended quotation itself. Here in Eph. 2:14-17 the exegesis of Isaiah finds the fulfilment of prophecy in the circumstances of history.⁵ Christ has transformed the promise as one simply for Jews so that Gentiles are included. The writer is not simply giving his interpretation. He is stating what has happened. The author is not using a speculative cosmic idea, but the promise of scripture and Pauline teaching of reconciliation (see section 7.1).⁶

9.4 The place of the passage in the general thought of Ephesians.

Ephesians may have started its life as a homily on the theme of all things being united in Christ. A necessary stage for this final goal was for Jew and Gentile to become one. Thus 14-17 contain a theme which is central to the book, being an apt one for a mixed group of readers who are addressed as "we" and "you".

9.5 Ephesians 2:14-17 in the context of Ephesians as a whole.

2:14-17 stands out because of the richness of thought presented in such condensed fashion. It is clearly one of the finest and most significant passages in the book. But it is not contrary to the book's teaching and forms the core of chapter 2. In fact the prologue 1:1-10 writes similarly in the first person plural of what God has done for us in Christ, through his blood (1:7) to bring all things together (1:10). 1:12, 13 shows the two groups sharing in Christ, and in 1:23 the church is his body. 3:6 takes up the theme again of Gentiles with Israel being members together of one body. Chapter 3 shows how the writer believes he is called as a servant/

servant to make this message known to Gentiles (3:8) and how through the church God's manifold wisdom is to be made known to the rulers and authorities in the heavenly realm.

He continues to pray that the family (3:14) may be strengthened and have power. In chapter 4 he urges them to reflect their unity and use their respective gifts to build up the body to perfection. 4:17ff again thinks of the Gentiles who are still without Christ in contrast to those who know him (4:20ff). The contrast is found again in 5:8 and later in the chapter we have the final perfect picture of the one body the church (5:23-32). The letter concludes with exhortation and personal matters. Thus the theme of 2:14-17 is vitally connected to the book as a whole and succinctly summarizes it.

9.6 The relation to the Pauline Corpus.

The passage speaks of reconciliation through Christ's work which is a Pauline theme (see 7.1 and the next section) and shows that by the Christ event the former distinctions among people have now been rendered obsolete. This is the theme of Paul's message in Rom. 1:18-2:29.⁷ God's action in Christ has altered the relationship between Jew and Gentile (3:21ff). Thus Rom. 9-11 (Salvation History)⁸ and Rom. 3:31ff (Justification) go together. There may not be the division between these two themes that is sometimes found by Pauline scholars. Rom. 9-11 deals with the future of Israel and is clearly vital to Paul's teaching in Romans. He sees the Jews as having a major part in God's plan. This thought finds an echo in Eph. 2:14-17. Whereas Eph. 2 looks from the past when the Jews only had the privileges which Gentiles have now come to share, Rom. 9-11 looks at things from the present situation in the church where Gentiles but not many Jews are enjoying the blessings. In both writings the end result is the same. Jew and Gentile will be together because of what God has done in Christ. Rom. 1-3 teach that although the Jews originally had the blessings they gained little through them because they did not believe and had turned aside (cf. Heb. 4:2). But the Jew is still placed first (Rom. 2:10) and has many advantages (Rom. 3:1, 2). It can be assumed by the writer that God is the God of the Jews, but has to be emphasized that he is the God of the Gentiles also (Rom. 3:29). Rom. 4 portrays Abraham as the father of one people, Jew and Greek, the father of all who believe./

believe. This is also taught in Gal. 3:7ff where all men of faith are blessed together with Abraham. Ephesians rejoices in this same fact.

9.7 Reconciliation.

Is the teaching of Ephesians on reconciliation (a) in harmony with Paul's teaching on the subject, (b) a development from it, (c) not in total agreement?

We have seen in section 7.1 that Ephesians and Colossians use an extra preposition prefixed to the verb ἁλλάσσω but there is little difference in the use of the concept which in the New Testament is only found explicitly in the Pauline writings, especially Romans 5:1-11, 2 Cor. 5:18-20 and Col. 1:20-22 which has parallels with Eph. 2:14-17.

Normally reconciliation means men's separation from God or God's separation from men. The latter is not so clearly stressed. A change of attitude towards the sinner on God's part is implied, but never do we find the statement that God has been reconciled to people.

Human sin is the cause of the need for reconciliation in the passages from Romans and 2 Corinthians but this is not so prominent in the Ephesian passage. However the word enmity is used in Eph. 2:15 and sin is mentioned in the wider context (2:1). We know from 1:7 that the result of Christ's death is the forgiveness of sins. Moreover in 2 Cor. 5 there is no mention of the death of Christ, which is probably assumed.

The concept of reconciliation is important but it must not be exaggerated.⁹ A. Richardson says it is always implied in passages where Paul talks about peace.

Further oversimplifications are to equate the word with justification¹⁰ or with righteousness.¹¹

The writer of Col. 1:20 believes that through his death Christ constituted a relationship with all things. Whitely finds an analogy to the relationship established in the Old Testament by means of the blood of the covenant. Such an analogy can also be applied to/

to Eph. 2:13 and 17. "Christ by the blood of his cross established a relationship with God for Jew and Gentile alike, which resembled but transcended that established through Moses on Mt. Horeb."¹² The cosmic emphasis of Colossians appears in 2 Cor. 5:19 which says God was reconciling the world to himself. This leads naturally to such statements as we find in Eph. 2:14-17. Rom. 8:19ff has a cosmic view which may perhaps be the basis for what Paul says in Col. 1:19ff.¹³ Rom. 11-15 contemplates the fact that if the rejection of the Jews means the reconciliation of the world their acceptance will effect "life from the dead". God's reconciling action which has already become a reality in the past through Christ's death is not complete because the "ministry of reconciliation still exhorts people to be reconciled to God. This reconciliation is intended to embrace the whole world (Col. 1:20) but has not yet reached everybody.

Ephesians appears to develop Paul's teaching. Christ is not simply the instrument of reconciliation but actually reconciles humanity to himself. This latter idea may be found in 2 Cor. 5:19, 21 where God reconciles in Christ and Christians are ambassadors for Christ (rather than for God).

Any development found in Ephesians can be explained if the letter is later than the other Pauline passages on reconciliation. Opinion is divided over whether Eph. 2:11-22 represents an extension of the apostle's teaching to a concrete situation by Paul's later thinking or by a member of his group.¹⁴ R.P. Martin suggests that the application to ethnic problems of the later church results in a clear statement of reconciliation as ensuring the breakdown of racial and cultural impediment.¹⁵ Martin has expanded this viewpoint in his recent book, Reconciliation: A Study of Paul's Theology.¹⁶ He gives a thorough study of Paul's teaching on reconciliation, but we cannot be sure that the suggestions he puts forward are likely to be true. He explores the possibility of the concept reconciliation being an umbrella idea to accommodate the leading aspects of Paul's theological thinking. To be certain of this, he would have needed at the same time to make an equally thorough study of the other Pauline concepts before reaching a conclusion.

The trajectory which Martin suggests is an interesting one. Reconciliation is used first in a cosmic way in earlier Christian material that Paul uses in 2 Cor. 5:18-21 and Col. 1:15-20. Paul adds/

adds "not reckoning their trespasses against them" (2 Cor. 5:19) and "we beg you on Christ's behalf be reconciled to God" (5:20c) thus making salvation more personal. To the impersonal Colossian hymn he adds "making peace by the blood of his cross" and "so paved the way for an extended application of reconciliation to his reader's situation in vv. 21, 22" (p.115).

Martin then looks at Romans and the change between chapters 4 and 5. The framework is apocalyptic as far as 4:25 but in chapter 5 the letter becomes more personal and the term reconciliation is now used.

After Paul's death in A.D. 65 and the fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70, Gentiles begin to forget their Jewish heritage. A Pauline disciple uses Paul's teaching as expressed in a song of reconciliation, adding "through the cross", "the dividing wall of the fence" and "abolishing the law of commandments". He does this to remind his readers how Jew and Gentile became one new man in Christ.

It is impossible to prove whether the flight of the trajectory is a correct one as regards order with the Colossian hymn first and most closely linked with the primitive church and the teaching of Jesus. If Ephesians is last, there need not be such a gap in time as Martin proposes. There are not sufficient historical clues to show it is later than Paul or developing his teaching further. A situation of harmony in one of his churches could lead Paul to write with relief in contrast to the crises which prompted many of his letters.

9.8 Pauline authorship.

What we have discerned does not run contrary to the traditional view, so gives no weight to views of non-Pauline authorship, which may be held on other grounds such as (a) Ephesians reflects early catholicism,¹⁷ (b) gnosticism,¹⁸ or (c) the concept of a Sinai mystery.¹⁹

Paul is supposed to be individualistic, whereas Ephesians stresses the social character of Christ's work, but it has been shown that Paul was not merely concerned with the salvation of the individual Gentile, but that Israel should be made jealous and then turn and be saved, thus bringing about "the salvation of mankind".²⁰ A social (Jew-Gentile) and religious (God-man) reconciliation are compatible and complementary.²¹

As we mentioned in 9.6 there tends to be a division among contemporary scholars as to whether justification is central in Paul²² or Salvation History.²³ Ephesians shows both are fundamental. If the author is not Paul he has remarkably mended the tension which was in Paul's mind. Either Paul resolved the tension himself or someone else does it for him. The former is more likely.

In our discussion we have found that the general character of Ephesians is due to the correspondent Tychicus being responsible for conveying personal matters orally. This may give him a big role. But when somebody is in prison, he has to give responsibilities to others. Thus the almost universally held view that if Paul wrote it, it could not have been addressed to the Ephesian Church he knew so well, is not so conclusive as has been assumed. A growing church would include new members who were strangers to Paul (1:15).

The parallel letter to the Colossians has an even more cosmic outlook. Principalities and powers are a greater danger to Colossian readers than to the Ephesians. But neither letter is sufficiently different from Paul to require a separate author or sufficiently similar to require that Paul wrote them both.

There are five traditional areas in which the Pauline authorship of Ephesians has been questioned.

a) Vocabulary. The number of words in Ephesians not found in the rest of the New Testament is forty-four. This ratio of approximately one new word every four verses is the same as in 2:14-17. Words and phrases that the writer of Ephesians uses in a slightly different manner from Paul (e.g. κεφαλή) are not found here nor his favourite expressions or words (e.g. ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις, διαβόλος) but his favourite prepositions ἐν and κατά are used.

b) Style. The style of Ephesians is reverberating and there are alleged redundant expressions such as τῷ κράτει τῆς ἰσχύος . We have discussed the several apparent repetitive statements in our passage. There is no significant difference from what exists in the remainder of the letter.

c) Historical setting. Jew and Gentile are now one in the church. This has been one of the arguments used to attribute a post-Pauline date for Ephesians and has been drawn from this passage. This dispute was presumably over by the time of Romans. If Ephesians is/

is later than Romans (i.e. a Roman imprisonment letter but within the lifetime of Paul) it would reflect a stage further on than that of Romans. Other references to the historical setting lie outside this passage and it has nothing to say about them.

d) Theology. The church is universal not local (Eph. 5:32). The suspected differences about the theology of the church come from passages outside 2:14-17.

Although 2:14-17 does not explicitly mention the church, it is clearly that which is formed of the uniting of Jews and Gentiles. In Paul, Christ is the instrument of salvation, but in Ephesians (including 2:14-17) he is more than an instrument. He appoints prophets, apostles, etc.

We have shown in the previous section that the views on reconciliation are not un-Pauline.

Conclusions about the suspected differences in eschatology are not affected by a study of this passage.

e) Literary relationships. Ephesians has many links with Colossians (Eph. 1:15-17, 22f; 3:7-9; 4:3f, 22f, 25f; 6:5ff, 18-22) although Ephesians may use the passages in a different way. Our passage has some of the more striking parallels with Colossians (Col. 1:20-22, 2:14) but nothing which demands that another author rather than Paul must have used Colossians.

These five areas of discussion when related to 2:14-17 in particular show there is little which really adds to the existing discussion on the authorship of the book. It has some of the Pauline ideas and also some of the peculiar characteristics of Ephesians.

The theme of the section of Ephesians is Pauline. The situation of the readers may be responsible for the different emphases and different use of terms. Any difference here can be the result of the use of other scripture passages. Nothing in 2:14-17 seriously undermines or mitigates against Pauline authorship of the book. It is only when one is convinced Paul did not write it that all the possibilities raised in 2.2 become plausible.

Little evidence has been found to add to the existing discussion about who wrote the letter. 2:14-17 is a condensed form of the message of Ephesians and near to the heart of what Paul himself preached, that Jew and Gentile are now together in Christ, because they have been brought near to God.

NOTES FOR CHAPTER ONE

1. Schlier and Gnllka detect a hymn, Barth does not.
2. To distinguish between theological and social is not exactly correct. the social distinctions between Jew and Gentile were theological.
3. Full details of the text as shown in the 19th century are to be found in G.F.C. Tischendorf, Lipsiae 1872, p.674. He lists no readings for v.14. Those for vv15-17 are as follows

15. ε (non Gb Sz) λύσας·¹⁵ τὴν ἑχθρὰν ἐν τ. σα. αὐτοῖ, etc, Lu 16: 15 τὴν ἑχθρὰν ἐν τ. σα. αὐτοῖ, etc | FG ἐχθρὰν, Item v. 16 | ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ: ita et. Tert^{marc} 17, additque: „sed Marcion abstulit sua, ut inimicitias daret carnem, quasi carnali vitio, non Christo aemulae.“ | καταργήσας (d e destituens, g destruens, f vg Ir^{int} 310 Victorin Ambrat rell *eracuans*): D⁸⁷ E⁸ καταργήσας | κτίσας: P 47. 116. 118. al² sc^r -σι | ἐν αὐτῷ cum M⁸ AB⁸ P 3. 14. 17. 31. 37. 47. 219. 238. Ath¹¹⁴ cod Procop^{inceph} 1,1020 et¹⁰¹⁸ ... ε Ti ἐν αὐτῷ cum M⁸ DEFGL al pler sy^p Eus^{mal} 237 Ath⁴¹⁴ ed et⁶⁰⁹ Epiph^{ana} Chr Euthalcod Cyr^{thos} 104. 105 Thdr^t Dam. Item in se ipso d e Hier, in *semetipso* f g m¹⁰⁶ vgle demid tol Or^{int} 4,505. 648 Victorin al, am fu al in *semet ipsum*, etc ... 59^o cop Ath⁴²⁶ Epiph^{7,68} Thdr^t 2,1081 (sed non ad h. l.) om | εἰς εἰς: F⁸⁷ εἰς (sed s puncto notatum) | καίτοι: K και μόνον, F⁸⁷ G⁸⁷ καίτοι

16. ἀποκαταλλάξῃ (FG -αζῇ): KLP al plus¹⁰ -αζῇ | ἐν ἐν σώματι τοῦ θ¹⁰: Thdr^t 2,1081 ἐν ἐν πνεύματι πρὸς τὸν θ¹⁰ | ἐν αὐτῷ: FG 115. ἐν αὐτῷ, Item in *semetipsum* d e, in *semetipso* f g m¹⁰⁶ vg go arm edd. lat ap Hier Victorin Ambab^{ra} 2,8 Aug^{cont} fau^{al} 22 al; contra Tert^{marc} 5,17 in eo (quod respicit ad verba in uno corpore), Hier in ea (l. o. cruce). Cf Hier^{7,581}: „per crucem interficiens inimicitiam in ea. Non ut in Latinis codicibus habetur, in *semetipso*, propter Graeci pronomina ambiguitatem. ἐν αὐτῷ enim et in *semetipso* et in ea, id est cruce, intelligi potest, quia crux, id est σταυρός, iuxta Graecos generis masculini est.“

17. εἰρηγῇ sec loco cum M⁸ AB⁸ DEF⁸ 17. 71. 80. (D⁸⁷ bis εἰρηγῇ) d e f g vg go cop arm aeth^{utr} Or^{int} 4,513 Eus^{pe} 327 Procop^{ea} 519 Cyr²⁹⁸ Hil¹⁷⁸ Victorin Ambrat Hier al mu. Cf et. Naas^{blpp} 111 και ποιῶσιν εἰρηγῇ τοῖς μακρὰν, τοῦτοις τοῖς ὑλικοῖς και χοϊκοῖς, και εἰρηγῇ τοῖς ἐγγύς, τοῦτοις τοῖς πνευματικοῖς etc ... ε om cum KL al pler sy^{utr} Dial⁴⁶⁹. 671 Const^{7,54} Eus^{pe} 328 Chr⁴⁴ Euthalcod Thdr^t Dam. Cf et. Tert^{marc} 5,17: Hoc itaque annuntiante pacem eis qui prope, et eis qui longe, accessum consecuti etc.

4. M.Goguel (cited Schlier 24f) distinguishes the older from Paul, the other from a disciple of Paul 10 - 20 years later, who inserted the unique theology. e.g. 1:10, 1:20b - 23, 2:14 - 18, 20 - 22, 3:2 - 13, 4:8 - 10, 5:23b - 24, 25b - 27 29b - 32 and 6:12 - 13. This would mean that 2:14 - 18 did not have originally its present context. But the style outside of the possible hymnic passages in ch 2 is similar and one cannot say why one must be older than the other.

NOTES FOR CHAPTER TWO

1. In addition to the more widely known commentaries see Martin, 2:1 - 10 The effect of Christ in the heart; 11 - 22 Christ's opening of God's covenant to the Gentiles (p23); 2:1 - 10 Transformed lives and their goal; 11 - 22 The share of the Gentiles in the covenant mercies of Israel, through Christ's mission and death. (p47)
H.Dietzfelbinger, "The message of Ephesians" in Dahl, Kurze, p84, 1 - 10 made alive, 11 - 22 no more strangers and foreigners. Caird, 1 - 10 God's power in redemption, 11 - 22 the new humanity. Kirby p129, says 1 - 10 are nothing more than a duplication of what is said in 1:3 - 14 looked at from different points of view. Those who have been dead have been made alive and those who were alienated have been reconciled.
2. Lamadrid 1:212 thinks 1 - 10 is a miniature Romans. We then have (a) 11 - 12 Gentiles before conversion in relation to Jews (b) 13 conversion of Gentiles to God (c) 14 - 18 development of the content of this bringing near to God, and (d) the present situation of the Gentiles (216). The affirmation of v.13 marks the culminating point of the entire section, 11 - 12 is the protasis of preparation, 14 - 18 explains the contents of v.13 and 19 - 22 the consequence (p220).
3. cf M.Barth (p275), 11 - 12 is "the description of the division of mankind" 13 - 18 "the praise of Christ's work of reconciliation" 19 - 22 "the elaboration of the tangible results of peace, i.e. the growing church".
4. Matthew provides another example. S.T.Lachs, "Some textual observations on the Sermon on the Mount", JQR 69 (1978) 98 - 111, esp 101. "For theirs is the kingdom of heaven" begins and ends the passage 5:3 - 10. Cf J.C.Fenton, Inclusio and Chiasmus in Matthew, St Ev 111, Berlin, 1964.
M.Dahood, The Psalms, New York, 1966 vol 1, xxxiif has shown this feature in much earlier Semitic poetry of the Psalms and Ugarit.
5. J.Calvin, The Institutes of the Christian Religion, (1559), 2:11:11. He quotes Pss 2:8 and 72:8 as support for the heathen receiving the blessing. But these texts, especially the former speak of force and destruction rather than salvation.
6. Ch.Masson, L'Épître de St Paul aux Éphésiens, Neuchâtel and Paris, 1953 cited as Masson and *ad loc*, lists Haupt, Rendtorf and J.Schneider as/

as refusing to see a reference to relations of Gentiles with Israel.

7. H.Conzelmann, Der Brief an die Epheser, Göttingen, 1976, shows that the centre of Ephesians is Christ as the instrument and "topos" of salvation. Penna, La Proiezione, regards as a reasoned call to unity. H.H.Culpepper, "Ephesians - A manifesto for the mission of the church", Rev Exp 76 (1979) p.553-8, says the book understands the real purpose of the church's mission is that she should be a heritage for God's glory. R.P.Meyer, Kirche und Mission in Epheserbrief, Stuttgart 1977 thinks the reconciliation of Jew and Gentile is the model and the beginning of the unity of all in Christ.

8. See Kirby, p.140. Fischer. J.L.Houlden, Philippians, Colossians, Philemon and Ephesians, London 1970, p.154.

P.Dacquino, "Interpretatio Epistolae ad Eph in luce finis intenti", VD 36 (1958) 338 - 49 speaks of the unique function of Christ in achieving this unity. Lindemann, denies any salvation history in Ephesians, since it deals with the subject of the abolition of time (cf. the title of his book).

All however who believe in Salvation History would say that culmination has come in Christ.

Penna, La Proiezione, finds in Ephesians a use of the cosmic to encourage ecclesial unity. There is (p.177) the projection of unity in the community on to the cosmic plane.

9. N.A.Dahl, Bible Study on Ephesians in Dahl, Kurze says the first part is the greatness of the calling and the second part is the inference of the calling. cf. D.C.George, 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Nashville, 1979, 1 - 3 : God's great plan, 4 - 6 : Worthy living for God's people.

C. Maurer, "Der Hymnus von Eph.1. als Schlüssel zum ganzen Brief," Ev.Th 11 (1951 - 2) 151 - 72, J.T.Sanders, "Hymnic Elements in Eph 1 - 3" ZNW 56 (1965) 214 - 32. Dahl, Adresse, 262, Schlier 72 regard 1:3 - 14 as the key to the whole epistle rather than a subdivision of the first part. E.Käsemann, "Epheser", RGG 1958 2.517 - 8 and W.Marxsen, Introduction to the New Testament, Oxford 1968, 193, treat the whole of ch.1 as an independent opening section of the epistle. 1 - 2 = Preface, 3 - 14 = Thanksgiving, 15 - 23 = Intercession.

10. Gnllka p.193 calls the second part "Weisungen an die Kirche in der Welt".

11. Schlier.27.

12. H.J.Holtzmann/

12. H.J.Holtzmann, Kritik der Epheser und Kolosserbriefe, Leipzig, 1872 pp304 - 5.
13. O.Pfleiderer, Paulinism vol.2 London, 1891, pp178,9.
14. For a discussion of whether Paul's writings are letters and how they compare with contemporary epistolary activity, see W.G.Doty, Letters in Primitive Christianity, Philadelphia (1973, cited as Doty). He uses evidence from the time of Alexander the Great's Empire, when letters were needed for communication over a vast area. Doty discusses Cicero, Apollonius of Tyre, Seneca etc and argues that Paul was the person who adapted Graeco - Roman letter models for Christian purposes. See also his "The Classification of Epistolary Literature", CBQ 31 (1969) 185 - 199.

For Hebrew letters see D.Pardee, "An overview of ancient Hebrew Epistolography", JBL 97 (1978) 321 - 46. This article is written in the context of a larger research project of the Epistolography Group of the Society of Biblical Literature, Missoula, Montana, USA.

The form and function of the Greek letter and the letter's body in the non - literary papyri and in Paul, are discussed in J.L.White's Dissertation, The Body of the Greek Letter, Missoula, 1972.

15. A.Deissmann, Paul, London, 1912, pp8ff, distinguished between letters and epistles. He regarded Epistles as formal, literary treatises, whereas letters were really written conversation (I to you) not for future artistic or aesthetic appreciation, but purely for the momentary needs of situations and in Paul's case dashed off in the hurry of a busy apostolic career. Deissmann based this distinction on the fact that we have hundreds of ordinary letters of unknown men and women of the Hellenistic and Roman periods, and non - literary ones of Epicurus and Cicero, as distinct from the numerous literary letters in prose of these writers, Lysias, Aristotle and Seneca, plus the poetical ones of Horace and Ovid.

However Deissmann overdid this distinction. It is now widely accepted that Paul's letters are not just private and personal. They claim to be "written to communities of Christian believers for use in their common life and written by Paul in his self - conscious capacity as an official representative of early Christianity". (D.J.Selby, Toward the understanding of Paul, Eaglewood Cliffs, 1962), (cited Doty p.25). This is true of Romans, but in most cases, he wrote to churches of which he was the actual founder.

P.Vielhauer, Geschichte der urchristlichen Literatur, Berlin and New York/

New York, 1975, p.59, finds Deissmann's distinction attractive but feels it does not do justice to the wide varieties of letter form. Most scholars however think that Deissmann's distinction is invalid. Paul's letters do have some artistry as J.Weiss, History of Primitive Christianity, London, 1937, 1. pp.401ff has shown. There is parallelism and artistic form (e.g. Rom 14:7ff and 1. Cor 2:6 - 9). Introductions vary according to the letter. There is "captatio benevolentiae" such as "joy and crown", "known in all the world"; extravagance of style (pray without ceasing), the piling up of expressions (1. Thess 2:17 - 3:13) homiletic tone, artistry of expression, antithesis and versatility. Many of these characteristics are found in Eph 2:14 - 17. Even such personal letters as Philippians and Philemon give indication of structure.

On the distinction between letter and epistle see J.A.Fitzmyer, "Some Notes on Aramaic Epistolography", JBL 93 (1974) 201 - 25 esp. 204. The Aramaic corpus is made up solely of "letters" in Deissmann's broad category.

J.C.Beker, "Contingency and Coherence in the Letters of Paul", Union SemQR 33 (1978) 141 - 51 thinks Paul's letters are both personal - occasional documents reflecting particular situations and authoritative documents.

Cicero's letters are of all kinds, condolence, affection, apology, literary criticism, philosophical discussion, town gossip, business letters. But his political letters far outnumber the others. He goes straight to the point. e.g. Ep ad Familiares 1:7:1 to Publius Lentulus Spinther, (Aug 56 BC) "I have read your letter, in which you tell me you are pleased because I keep you so regularly informed on all matters and you can easily see my goodwill to you. As to the latter, it is essential that I should prove my sincere affection for you. Whenever I can get hold of trustworthy men in whose hands I can properly put them, I shall not miss the opportunity". This example is similar to many parts of Paul's.

F.F.Church, "Rhetorical Structure and Design in Paul's Letter to Philemon", HTR 71 (1978) 17 - 33, shows how attention to rhetorical patterns and forms of the ancient authorities can give insight into the shape and design of Paul's letters. Philemon has the Exordium (4 - 7) The Proof (8 - 16) The Peroration (17 - 22).

16. Schlier discovers that although it is a letter in its present form, it is a summary of Paul's Gospel.
17. P.T.O'Brien/

17. P.T.O'Brien, "Ephesians 1:1, An unusual introduction to a N.T. Letter" NTS 25 (1978-9) 504 - 516, suggests that the reported prayers point to a more general apostolic concern for these Gentile recipients than a close personal and pastoral relationship. (515)
18. J.Coutts, "Eph. 1:3 - 14 and 1. Pet. 1:3 - 12", NTS 3 (1956 - 7) 115 - 127, and CL. Mitton, The Epistle to the Ephesians, Oxford 1951 p.185, find similarities in the early verses of Ephesians and 1 Peter.
19. James is nearer than other New Testament epistles to Diatribe. cf Epictetus who flourished cir 50 - 120 AD and used the method of questions and answers plus the imperative.
20. The Letter of Egnostus (from Nag Hammadi) is a theological treatise about the God of Truth, but it is in the form of a letter, beginning and ending with a personal paragraph. See Foerster, 2, pp24 - 39. This translation forms the basis of gnostic quotations in this thesis.
21. Letters would not be a feature of Mystery Religions, since the experiences were gained by initiation, not by information. Initiates were sworn to secrecy. See H.A.A.Kennedy, St. Paul and the Mystery Religions, London and New York, 1913.
22. Seneca, Ad Lucilium Epistulae Morales (cir AD 63) begins "you have asked me". He deals with themes similar to Paul's, e.g. on saving time (1), on living to oneself (10), on worldliness (19), on practising what you preach (20), on quiet conversation (28). cf. J.N.Sevenster, Paul and Seneca, Leiden 1961, p24, who shows Paul's letters are distinctive.
23. R.L.Archer, "The Epistolary Form in the New Testament", Exp. T 63 (1951 - 2) 296 - 8. (quotation from 296). Archer points out that Cicero was in disgrace under Augustus and Tiberius. Then Claudius admired him and his letters became the model for all letters. "In the providence of God an eccentricity of Seneca and the Roman admiration for Cicero's style, gave us nearly half our New Testament". (p.298). Ephesians has a greeting and a conclusion which the letters of Seneca lack. G.Friedrich, ThLZ 81 (1956) 353ff, has shown that the prescript of the Pauline letters does not correspond to the foremost oriental letter style. E.Lohmeyer, Die Briefe an die Philipper und die Kolosser und an Philemon, Göttingen, 1930, and Probleme paulinischer Theologie 1. ZNW 26 (1927) 158 - 173.
24. cf. Daniel 4:10. Ephesians however is unique in the Pauline Corpus in that it has both a berekah, 1:3ff and an introductory thanksgiving, 1:15 - 23. See P.T.O'Brien, op.cit and Introductory Thanksgivings in the/

in the Letters of Paul, Leiden, 1977.

25. Merklein, Amt p.25, says there is no parallel to compare with Ephesians. He calls it a Tractate (p.53). But J.A.Fischer, "Pauline Literary Forms and Thought Patterns", CBQ 39 (1977) 209 - 223, esp 216, argues that Paul's writings should be viewed against the background of Biblical sapiential literature, cf J.L.White, op.cit.
26. cf. R.P.Martin's list in New Testament Foundations 2, Exeter, 1977, pp 241 ff. There is the Open Letter, i.e. propaganda material for the later Roman authority (Sallust, cir 86 - 34 BC), the one designed to change public opinion pioneered by Isocrates (cir 436 - 338 BC), and the non - real letter for no particular situation or constituency.
27. J.B.Pollhill "An introduction to Ephesians" Rev Exp 76 (1979) 465 - 79, says no one can deny the uniqueness of the vocabulary and style. The question is whether Paul would have written an entire epistle in such a style.
28. E.Kasemann, op.cit, 2. 517. 166 and W. Marxsen, op.cit. p.192. discern a tract.
29. Cicero, op.cit. 1:7:1 (cited Martin, op.cit. p.242) might commit part of what he wanted to say to a courier, who would be relied upon to transmit by word of mouth. cf. 2 Thess. 2: 2, 3:17; 1 Cor. 4:17.
30. cf. 1 Clement 47. As early as the canonical 2. Corinthians, folk visit Corinth in an official capacity, e.g. Titus and the brother "whose praise is in all the churches", (8:16 - 18).
31. e.g. those in the Lycus valley. See Schlier, Epheser, p.18. Penna, La Proiezione , pp 165, 166 suggests it is for many Christian groups living in various cities.
G.Wilson, Ephesians, Edinburgh, 1978 p.12, Colossians was the antidote to the heresy, Ephesians was the tonic that followed.
Hunter, The Fifth Evangelist, London, 1970, 140 suggests the bearer of the letter Tychicus would reach Ephesus first on his travels.
J.N.Sanders, "The Case for the Pauline Authorship", in F.L.Cross, Studies in Ephesians, London, 1956, p.15, says it is "not really a letter, though its form is epistolary". He calls it "Paul's spiritual Testament to the Church" (p.16).
32. Details are set out in full in the Commentaries and by J.Schmid. Der Epheserbrief des Apostels Paulus, Biblische Studien, vol 22, Freiburg im Breisgau, 1928. and E.Best, "Ephesians 1:1" in Text and Interpretation. Studies in the New Testament presented to Matthew Black

Matthew Black, ed. E. Best and R. McL. Wilson, Cambridge, 1979, pp 29 - 41.

33. cf. 1 Macc. 14:17 - 23 and 15:16 - 24, which imply circular letters. Polycarp was asked by the church at Philippi for copies of letters of Ignatius which he had. This shows that churches kept, copied and circulated letters by church leaders. (See Polycarp, To the Philippians, ch.13).
34. Origen, The Catenae. See J.A.F. Gregg, "The Commentary of Origen upon the Epistle to the Ephesians", JTS 3 (1902) 233 - 44, 398 - 420, 551 - 576, esp 235. Origen relates τοῖς οὖσιν to the singular participle with the article in the divine name of Ex 3:14, linking with 1 Cor 1:28f, "The saints who have real existence" E. Best, op.cit. p.32 thinks this is far fetched. But Origen did not know the letter as Ephesians. (De Princ. 3.5.4.).
35. Basil adv. Eunom. 2:19, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς ἐφεσίοις ἐπιστέλλων ὡς γνησίως ἠνικρενοῖς τῇ ὄντι δι' ἐπιγνώσεως ὄντας αὐτοὺς ἰδιαζόντως ᾠνόμασεν εἰπὼν τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς οὖσι καὶ πιστοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ οὕτως γὰρ καὶ οἱ προ ἡμῶν παρασεσῶκασι καὶ ἡρεῖς ἐν τοῖς παλαιοῖς τῶν ἀντιγράφων ἠερίκαμεν

Ephraem's commentary (Syriac) does not mention the words "In Ephesus" but in his commentary on Col. 1:1 he has "to the saints and the faithful", with no reference to Colosse.

36. J. Ernst, Die Briefe an die Philipper, an Philemon an die Kolosser, an die Epheser, RNT 1974, p266, cf. F.W. Beare, "Ephesians" (Interpreters' Bible, vol X) New York 1953, pp 601ff "to the saints, who are also faithful", which is almost a tautology (see Best op.cit p.33). G. Zuntz, The Text of the Epistles, London 1953, p.228. n.1. says the Greek is forced. He finds the evidence slender and dubious. It is impossible to translate as E.J. Goodspeed τοῖς οὖσι καὶ πιστοῖς = "who are steadfast". H.J. Cadbury and K. Lake, The Beginnings of Christianity, edited by F.J. Foakes - Jackson and K. Lake IV. London 1942 p.56 have "to the local saints and believers in Jesus Christ". (Cf. Acts 5:17; 13:1; 14:13; 28:17)
37. M. Santer, "The Text of Ephesians 1:1", NTS 15 (1968/9) 247 - 8 τοῖς ἁγίοις καὶ πιστοῖς τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.
καὶ πιστοῖς/

καὶ πῖστοις was omitted through haplography, placed in the margin and then reinserted in the wrong place.

38. i.e. the Ionians. Ionia is the ancient name of the Ephesus region, used as late as Josephus. See W.C. Shearer, "To whom was the so-called Epistle to the Ephesians addressed?", Exp. T. 4(1892 - 3) 129.
39. These are the views respectively of R. Batey, P. Ladeuze and R. Scott. R. Batey "The Destination of Ephesians," JBL 82 (1963) 101 rejecting Ἰωνῖν suggests τοῖς ἀγίοις τοῖς Ἀσίαις (i.e. Ἀσίαις mistaken for οὐρανῖς) which he then changed to the masculine οὐρανῖν. P. Ladeuze, "Les Destinataires de l'Épître Éphésienne", RB 11 (o.s. 1902) 573 - 580 suggests κατ' Ἰωνῖν instead of καὶ πῖστοις. See J. Moffatt, An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament, Edinburgh, 3rd ed, 1918 p. 392. R. Scott cited Moffatt, ibid.
40. D.P. Ewald, pp 15f..
41. e.g. Hierapolis and Laodicea.
42. It could be a circular letter, like Revelation 2 and 3. But the 7 churches are mentioned specifically and individually addressed. J. Gnilya, p. 6 is as impressive as any when he suggests it was written to Ephesus and the surrounding district. The letter is therefore close to the idea of an encyclical. A cosmopolitan city would have contacts with churches in the hinterland. A. Schlatter thinks that since Ephesus was the chief place and mother church of the region to which the letter was sent, Tychicus had the commission of visiting every church in the region. A. Lindemann, "Bemerkungen zu den Adressaten und zum Anlass des Epheserbriefs", ZNW 67(1976) 235 - 251 exp. 238, suggests a pseudonymous author felt it appropriate that Paul should have written to the Ephesians. The scribes of some mss knew that this could not have been so, therefore they omitted the words.
43. See O. Roller, Das Formular der paulinischen Briefe, Stuttgart, 1933 pp 119 - 212 and 520 - 5. Τοῖς οὐρανῖν = original with a space left. Anyone wanting to omit name would have left out τοῖς οὐρανῖν as well.
44. cf. E. Best op.cit. pp 36f. The practice has parallels in the ancient world. (Roller op.cit. pp 207ff and Dahl, Addresse accept this).
45. Irenaeus/

45. Irenaeus, A.H.5.2.2. Clement, Strom 4.64 and Paed. 1.18 know the epistle as "to the Ephesians".
The evidence of the Muratorian Canon is unimportant, if it dates from the 4th century, cf. A.C.Sundberg, "Canon Muratori. A 4th century list?" HTR 66 (1973) 1 - 41.
46. E.Best op.cit p.31.
47. Words like $\epsilon\upsilon\ \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ would be cumbersome.
48. If the letter was not originally addressed to Ephesus, there is still no clear reason why the name should become attached to the letter.
49. I would question the almost universal assumption that if Ephesus was written to that city, Paul could not have written Ephesians, since it is too general for a church he had founded. Theodore of Mopsuestia (see Gnilka p.6) suggested Paul wrote it before he got there and Calvin p.133 passes over 1:15 "I have heard about you". The apparent lack of the author's acquaintance with the church may be secrecy due to imprisonment and personal matters being left to Tychicus. Many find the personal details in Romans 16:1 - 20 as originally written to Ephesians. See F.V.Filson, A New Testament History, London 1965, p.261.
50. Gnilka p.4 lists the following as accepting a circular letter. Albertz, Cerfaux, Dahl, Henshaw, H.J.Holtzmann, Klijn, Percy, Schlier, Staab, B.Weiss and Wikenhauser. For it being an introduction to the Pauline corpus see E.J.Goodspeed, "The Place of Ephesians in the first Pauline Collection", ATR 12 (1929 - 30) 189 - 212. The Meaning of Ephesians, Cambridge, Mass, 1933. "Ephesians and the First Edition of Paul", JBL, 70 (1951) 285 - 91. The Key to Ephesians, Chicago, 1956. C.L.Mitton, "Unsolved N.T. Problems", Exp.T, 59 (1947 - 8) 323 - 7. "E.J.Goodspeed's Theory regarding the author of Ephesians", Exp.T. 60 (1948 - 9) 320 - 1. "The Relationship between 1. Peter and Ephesians", JTS (n.s.1 (1950) 65 - 73. The Epistle to the Ephesians, Oxford, 1951. "The Authorship of the Epistle to the Ephesians", Exp.T. 67 (1955 - 6) 195 - 198. The Formation of the Pauline Corpus of Letters, London 1955. Ephesians, London 1976.
51. W.Schmithals, Paul and the Gnostics, Nashville, 1972, p.266 shows this does not matter and cites evidence against such a theory when despite variety of order, Ephesians is never at the head of the Pauline Corpus. H.Gamble, The Redaction of the Pauline Letters and the Formation of the Pauline Corpus, JBL, 94 (1975) 403 - 18 (p.409)/

- (p.409) shows that Ephesians is in every list of Pauline epistles and ms of which we have knowledge, (answering Schmithals' claim that the first collection only has 1 and 2 Cor., Gal., Phil., 1 and 2 Thess., and Romans). This by no means proves that Ephesians was intended to be a circular and a priori would be more likely to suggest that it is an authentic letter of Paul.
52. J.Coutts, "The Relationship of Ephesians and Colossians", NTS 4 (1957 - 8) 201-207 esp. 203. They must understand the privileges which are theirs through baptism.
 53. Chadwick, Absicht.
 54. Pokorný thinks it is post - Pauline, correcting a misunderstanding of Paul's doctrine of the church, which had arisen. Cf his "Epheserbrief und gnostische Mysterien", ZNW 53 (1962) 160 - 94.
 55. Gnülka, pp47ff.
 56. Fischer. Either the offices of bishop, presbyter and deacon did not exist in Asia Minor or he did not approve of them (33). Apostles and prophets are the foundation (p.47).
 57. E.Käsemann in Studies in Luke - Acts, ed. L.E.Keck and J.L.Martyn, Nashville, 1966 art. "Ephesians and Acts", pp288 - 97 esp 291. What Paul mentioned hypothetically in Rom 11 :17ff has happened here. Jewish Christianity is pushed aside and despised by the steadily growing Gentile Christianity.
 58. R.P.Martin op.cit pp224 and 233. Cf D.J.Rowston, "Changes in Biblical Interpretation Today : The Example of Ephesians", Bibl Theol Bull, 9 (1979) 121 - 5. discusses Martin's theory that Luke published the letter to the Ephesians in Paul's name, either during Paul's final stay in prison or after his martyrdom under Nero.
 59. Cf D.C.Smith, "Two Made One : Some observations on Eph 2:14 - 18", Ohio, JRS1(1973) 34 - 53 p.46, see Eph 3:6. Percy, Probleme, p.85. This does not involve a rejection of Käsemann's view that the purpose of Eph 2:11 - 22 is to prevent a rapidly developing Gentile Christianity from dissolving its ties with a diminishing Jewish Christianity. Cf Käsemann op.cit p.291 and RGG col 517, and J.P.Sampley, And the two shall become one flesh. A study of traditions in Eph 5:21 - 33, Cambridge 1971 pp160 - 161.
 60. See C.Vaughan, Ephesians, A study guide Commentary, Grand Rapids, 1977 M.J.Joseph "The Church in Paul" Indian Journal of Theology 28 (1979) 149 - 159, argues that the church's role in the plan of salvation is a provisional one and is a sign and means of God's ultimate purpose to unite all mankind.
 61. Lindemann/

61. Lindemann p.145, says most commentators see 11 - 22 in this way.
"In Eph 2:11 - 22 liegt der Mittelpunkt der theologischen Argumentation des ganzen Briefes".
62. P.Tachau "Einst" und "Jetzt im Neuen Testament", Göttingen 1972 pp142f.
63. For details see B.Rigaux, Letters of St Paul, Chicago, 1968, p.174 and the standard New Testament Introductions, e.g. N.Perrin, The New Testament Introduction, New York, 1974, p.135. He thinks Colossians uses the gnostic insights about the nature and function of the redeemer and applies them to his understanding of Christ.
F.V.Filson op.cit. pp.282 says that "in Ephesians the same cosmic role of Christ is asserted (1:10, 20 - 22) but the emphasis is on Christ's worldwide Lordship over the one universal church in which there must be no division based on previous religious privilege or lack of it".
64. Morna D.Hooker. "Were there false teachers in Colossae?" in Christ and Spirit in the N.T., Studies in Honour of C.F.D.Moule, ed, B.Lindars and S.S.Smalley, Cambridge 1973, pp315 - 31. She thinks there was no specific heresy at Colossae, only a general danger. Most would feel it was more definite than this (1:23, 2:4, 8, 16, 18 - 23). Yet Tychicus's visit is more for social and reasons of encouragement, than of warning (4:8).
W.D.Davies, "Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls, Flesh and Spirit" in K.Stendahl, The Scrolls and the New Testament, London 1958, pp157 - 82, esp 166f, shows the heresy has more Jewish links (e.g. Qumran) than gnostic. He lists connections in phraseology (his body of flesh in Col 1:22, cf. 2:11 and 1QpHab 9:1 - 2) calendrical niceties and sabbath regulations, food distinctions, asceticism, angelology etc. Bruce, Paul p.416, however shows that Colossae has no ceremonial washings.
65. P.D.Overfield, "Pleroma. A study in content and context", NTS 25 (1978 - 9) 384 - 96 provides evidence to show that there is no integral relationship between so - called technical or gnostic uses of the term in second century Christian heretical gnostic sects and the New Testament. The use by gnostics of pleroma is infrequent and pleroma is a common word in the first century.
66. See D.von Allmen, "Pour une synopse paulinienne", Biblica 57 (1976) pp 74 - 104. For Ephesians and Colossians see P.Perini - G.Berardi, Sinoesi Colossesi - Efesini, Fano. 1969. W.Ochel, Die Annahme einer Bearbeitung des Kolosser - briefes in Epheser-Brief, (thesis) Marburg, 1934, Cf.A.F.J.Klijn, Introduction to the New Testament, Leiden 1967 pp208 - 17. A.van Roon, The Authenticity of Ephesians, Leiden 1974, suggests/

- 1974 suggests a common rough blueprint of which both made partial use. Mitton, p.66 finds four corresponding passages, Eph 2:11 - 15 = Col 2:11 - 14 and Col 1:21 - 2. Eph 3:4, Col 4:3 and 1:26. Eph 3:17, Col 1:23 and 2:7. Eph 4:16, Col 1:8, 2:19 and 2:2.
67. Holtzmann, op.cit pp63 and 95.
68. cf. J.Schmid op.cit and P.N.Harrison, "Onesimus and Philemon", ATR 32 (1950) pp271 - 4 and Paulines and Pastorals, London, 1964 pp65ff. He says the most substantial insertions are 1:9b - 25 and 2:8 - 23. The interpolations include all the references to "head - body". See Bruce, Paul, p409.
69. A.S.Peake, A Critical Introduction of the New Testament, London, 1909, p.52, shows how awkward it is. M.Coguel, "Esquisse d'une solution nouvelle du problème de l'Épître aux Éphésiens" NHR 111, (1935) 254 - 284 and 112 (1936) 73 - 99, esp p.97 has also a too complicated suggestion. He thinks Ephesians was a circular letter in its original form. It passed through Laodicea and then Colosse. Interpolations were made at Ephesus at the same time as Colossians was written.
- The more complicated a theory is, the harder it is to say it is impossible, but the easier it is to say it is unlikely.
70. e.g. Lindemann, p.40, "Die Kolosserbrief ist wahrscheinlich die direkte literarische Vorlage des Epheserbriefes gewesen".
- Exceptions to the general view include S.Hoekstra, Theologisch Tijdschrift 1868, 599 - 652, W.Hönig ZWTH 1872, 63 - 87 (both cited by Percy, Probleme, p.3) Coutts op.cit, Schille, p.154, and "Der Autor des Epheserbrief", TLZ 82, 1957 332 - 334. Monod, P.Benoit, Rapports littéraires entre les épîtres aux Colossiens et aux Éphésiens, Nitliche Aufsätze, Festschrift für J.Schmid, ed.J.Blinzler et al, Regensburg, 1963. But in L'Hymne pp226 - 263 esp. 253f he suggests they are practically contemporary. One was intended for Colosse and our Ephesians for Laodicea. Ephesians has been redacted and Colossians retouched. F.C.Synge, Philippians and Colossians, 1951, pp 51 - 9 thinks Ephesians is the original and Colossians an imperfect imitation.
71. Lamadrid, 1:210 says that in presenting the history of salvation, Romans and Ephesians both give the negative first and then follow it with the positive, e.g. the negative is in Rom 1:18 and Eph 2:1 - 10.
- Percy, Probleme, p284 goes as far as to say that the basic thought behind 2:11 - 22 is no different from the genuine Pauline thought of Rom. 3:30/

Rom. 3:30, 10:12, 1 Cor 12:13, Gal 3:28 and Col 3:11. Eph 2:15f is like Gal 3:28f. This accords with Percy's advocacy of Pauline authorship of both Colossians and Ephesians.

On the relationship between Ephesians and Romans 9 - 11 see H. Chadwick, Absicht, 145ff, esp. p.148. He thinks Ephesians was an attempt to bring the various efforts and results of the Gentile mission under the wing of the unique apostleship of Paul.

72. I.H. Marshall, Acts, Leicester 1980 says Acts shows how the gospel was meant for the Gentiles as well as for the Jews. The spread of salvation to the Gentiles fulfilled the prophecies in the Old Testament and the promises of Jesus, Luke 24:47, Acts 1:4f, 20, 2:16 - 21, 3:24, 10:43, 13:40f, 47, 15:15 - 18, 28:25 - 28. A much more important aim of Luke is to show how the church composed of Jews and Gentiles stands in continuity with Judaism. The problem was whether the rise of the church had produced a new society that was different from Judaism. Was the church essentially a Jewish institution which Gentiles joined and from which unbelieving Jews cut themselves off. (cf. J. Jerrell, Luke and the People of God, Minneapolis 1972) or a new Israel, progressively separated from Judaism? (as J.C.O'Neill, The Theology of Acts in its historical setting, London, 1970²). Marshall finds the truth between these two extremes. Luke stresses the Jewish origin of the church and its roots in Old Testament prophecy, but shows that it is a people of God composed of believing Jews and Gentiles in which Jews may find the fulfilment of Judaism and Gentiles are not required to become Jews.

73. K. Stendahl, Paul among Jews and Gentiles and other essays, Philadelphia, 1976, p28, sees Romans 9 - 11 as central and climactic to Romans. The apostle is introducing his mission to the unknown church at Rome, to show how his mission fits into God's eternal plan. "The glorious secret whispered in his ear" is that the "no" of the Jews opened up the possibility of the "yes" of the Gentiles (28). It was not a question of strategy in going to the synagogue first, for Paul has to register the "no" of the Jews, before he was allowed to bring the gospel to the Gentiles.

E.P. Sanders, "Paul's attitude towards the Jewish people", Union SemQR 33 (1978) 175 - 87 thinks that Romans 9 - 11 are not the centre of gravity, but show Paul turning to a problem which to him was important (The Jewish rejection of Christ) after discussing the status of Gentiles, dying with Christ and the law.

C. von Weizsäcker/

C.von Weizsäcker, The Apostolic Age of the Christian Church, E.T.London 1894 - 5, 1.141, 165f, 373f, believed that Paul stressed divine sonship and that justification only occurs in conflict settings. W.Wrede, Paul, E.T.London 1907, argued that redemption from the powers of the present world was central. W.D.Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, 1970, 223f, found the centre in that through Christ the age to come is a present fact, proved by the advent of the spirit. E.P.Sanders, Paul and Palestinian Judaism, London 1977, 490 - 5, sees the theme of participation in Christ. J.Jeremias, The Central Message of the New Testament, London, 1965, 57 - 66 says justification by faith is but one of several examples of what Christ has done for the believer. H.Ridderbos, Paul: An outline of his theology, Grand Rapids, 1975, pp 161ff and G.E.Ladd, A Theology of the New Testament, Grand Rapids, 1974, p 374 stress Salvation History. See R.Y.K.Kung, "The Status of Justification by Faith in Paul's thought , a brief survey of a modern debate", *Themelios* 6 (1981) 4 - 11.

74. Lindemann, shows how in Ephesians, time and space are intertwined.

NOTES FOR CHAPTER THREE

1. Ewald p.133 $\nu\nu\nu\iota$ does not depend on $\acute{o}\tau\iota$ in v.12, because there is no $\rho\epsilon\nu$ and there is a new meaning to the conception of $\acute{o}\tau\iota$ $\acute{o}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ $\rho\alpha\kappa\rho\acute{\alpha}\nu$ (from God rather than Israel).
2. Lindemann p.67 shows that the "once-now" scheme is predominantly found in the Pauline literature, the Pastorals, Heb 12:26, 1 Pet 1:14f and Rev 17:30. Ephesians has it, apart from ch 2, in 5:8f and probably also in 4:23f.
3. cf. Pss 4, 9, 18, 32, 34, 40 etc. P.Tachau op.cit pp 52ff and 68ff shows that in the Old Testament and Judaism, including Qumran, it is not really found with any clarity. There are direct parallels in Joseph and Asenath 52 - 58. It is found in Stoic diatribe where it is part of a formal rhetorical scheme. The thought is found in Deut 15:15 and Ezekiel 16 (of Israel's experience) 2 Sam 22 : 20, 2 Sam 7:8 and 1 Chron 17:7 (of David's experience). Tachau explains its use by Paul as arising because of his personal conversion.
4. Mitton p.231 sees a well - advanced stage of development. E.J.Goodspeed, The Meaning of Ephesians, p.231 sees "a long retrospect" but Kirby p.129 does not think that "remember" necessarily implies this. Schlier p.17 thinks they had only been converted recently. Similarly N.A.Dahl, "Dopet Efesierbrevet" STK 21 (1945) 85 - 103. P.Carrington, The Primitive Christian Catechism, Cambridge 1940 pp75f and Percy, Probleme pp326 and 354.
5. Beet says it is a conspicuous and favourite phrase of Paul recalling the contrast ever present to his mind of the past and the present.
6. E.Lohse, The New Testament Environment, London 1976 p.241 says that at the time of Christianity's inception there were communities of followers of the mystery religions throughout the Roman Empire.
7. A.Deissmann, Die neutestamentliche Formel "in Christo Jesu" Marburg 1892.
8. A.Deissmann, Paul p.128.
9. E.Best, One Body in Christ, London, 1955, p.9.
10. ibid p.7. J.A.Mackay, God's Order, New York 1953 p.125 "To be in Christ is wider than to be in the church".
11. cf. Lindemann p.148 and Penna, La Proiezione, p.171.
12. So Penna ibid p.172 but Dibelius p.69 thinks "in his blood" is probably simply repeating "in Christ" from earlier in the verse.
13. J.A.Allan "The "in Christ" Formula in Ephesians" NTS 5 (1958-9) 54-62, thinks/

thinks it is instrumental here and is used differently from Paul, showing that the writer of Ephesians has failed to grasp Paul's deep and rich meaning of the corporate personality.

14. E.D.Roels, God's Mission, The Epistle to the Ephesians in Mission Perspective, Franeker 1962, pp 94, 5 refers to Christ as "the locus of salvation".
15. M.Barth, p.260.
16. Oepke TDNT 2:541f shows that Christ is a universal personality, not in the current hellenistic mystical sense, but cosmically and eschatologically. The first and second Adams include their adherents. Believers are transferred from one to the other.
17. C.C.Caragounis, The Ephesian Mysterion, Lund, 1977 pp136,7.
18. Salmond.
19. See section 4.12.
20. See C.F.D.Moule, An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek, Cambridge, 1959 p.206 citing H.G.Meecham "Romans 3:25ff and 4:25. The meaning of *dia* and the accusative", Exp.T, 50 (1938 - 9) 564.
21. Cardlish, p.13.
22. 1 John 5:6 has *διὰ* as well. 1 Peter 1:19 has the dative alone, but this is probably the dative of price.
23. cf. Cardlish, "he shall come in a young bullock" (Lev.16:3, Heb 9:25 and 10:19). cf "in his flesh" and "in one body" in Eph 2:14 - 17. (*ἐν ἐνὶ σάρτι* is unlikely to be instrumental, for this would involve taking the instrumental "through the cross" with the next phrase "killing the enmity") Between *ἐν* and *διὰ* no precise distinction can be drawn.
24. Schlatter says that 14 - 18 explain the meaning of the phrase.
25. Alford, p.13, cf Salmond.
26. cf. Mt 16:17, John 1:13, 6:54, 1 Cor 15:50 and Heb 2:14.
27. For details see B.S.Childs, Exodus, London, 1974, p.195 and M.Noth, Exodus, London 1962, p.90.
28. See Aurelius Prudentius Clemens (cir 348 - 405 AD) Peristephanon, 10:1011ff ed, A.Dressel, 1860 (cited TDNT 1:176).
29. John 6:53. There is also an Old Testament background in 1 Chr 11:19.
30. See Clement of Alexandria, Paid, 318:5 *ὡρὰ ἡ ἁγία κρεῖται οἱ προύπεροι Διόνυσω*
31. Arabia used to be suggested (e.g.W.Robertson Smith, The Religion of the Semites, London 1889 and 1894). It was followed by the Pan-Babylonian School of A.Jeremias and H.Winckler and then by the Canaanite (and Carthaginian) of R.Dussaud Les Origines Cananéennes du Sacrifice

du Sacrifice israélite, Paris, 1921 and Les Découvertes de Ras Shamra (Ugarit) et L'Ancien Testament, Paris, 1937.

32. It is possible that in Romans 3:24 - 26, Paul is borrowing from tradition. See note 34.

33. e.g. J.C.Kirby and Th.Innitzer, "Der "Hymnus" in Eph 1:3 - 14", ZTK 28 (1904) 612 - 21.

34. Reconciliation by blood is peculiar to the Pauline literature, but the New Testament frequently associates forgiveness with the blood of Christ, e.g. 1. John 1:7, Rev 1:5. Cf. La Madrid, 1:221ff. Paul may be citing an older credal formula in Rom 3:25. See R.Bultmann, The Theology of the New Testament, London, 1952, vol. 1 p.46.

E.Käsemann, "Zum Verständnis von Römer 3:24 - 26", ZNW 43 (1950 - 1) 150 - 4 (reprinted in vol. 1 of Exegetische Versuchen und Besinnungen), C.H.Talbert, "A non-Pauline fragment at Rom 3:24 - 26?" JBL 85 (1966) 287 - 96.

35. So B.F.Westcott, Commentary on the Epistles of John, London, 1902 pp34ff, but L.Morris, The Apostolic Preaching of the Cross, London, 1955, pp122ff and A.M.Stibbs, The Meaning of the word 'blood' in Scripture, London, 1954 link it with the life given, i.e. death. The writer and readers of Eph 2:13, would recall the Passover, the temple sacrifices, the Day of Atonement, but probably not circumcision.

It seems far-fetched to see the crucifixion in Eph 2:16 as a unique and spiritual circumcision of Jews and Gentiles, but it is just possible that 2:13 could refer to the circumcision of Christ. He shed blood that we might belong to the truly circumcised body. But there is no parallel in the New Testament to the flesh of v.15 being taken as the puendum See G.Vermes, "Baptism and Jewish Exegesis. New Light from Ancient Sources", NTS 4 (1957 - 58) 308 - 19. The Rabbis, perhaps as early as Paul's day, did speak of circumcision as sacrifice. When sacrifices were not possible this blood would become more significant. So Kirby, p.158, cf G.Vermes, "Scripture and Tradition in Judaism", Leiden, 1961, pp178 - 92 and H.Sahlin op.cit, who traces parallels to the Jewish baptismal liturgy for proselytes and the expiatory blood of their sacrifice. He contrasts the blood of circumcision with the blood of Christ. N.A.Dahl, "Christ, Creation and the Church" in W.D.Davies and D.Daube, eds The Background of the/

of the New Testament and its Eschatology, Cambridge, 1956 p.437, n.1, calls the theory that Eph 2:13 refers to circumcision, fantastic. (Cf Lamadrid 2.258.)

D.E.H.Whiteley, "St Paul's Thought on the Atonement", JTSns 8 (1957) 240 - 55 esp 247 - 9 relates blood in the reconciliation passages to "covenant blood" cf Ex 24:3 - 8. "The Apostle means that through his death, Christ constituted a relationship with all things analogous to that established in the OT by means of the blood covenant". (249) Cf his, The Theology of St Paul, Oxford, 1974 p.140.

E.P.Sanders op.cit, p.299 shows that Qumran's attitude to sacrifices was ambiguous because it was cut off from the temple. Sacrifices are predicted for the future in 1QM 2:5f and are presupposed in CD 9:13f, 11:17 - 12:2, 16:13 cf 4:1. But in the present, righteous acts and piety could be a substitute 1QS 9:4f. The community itself had an atoning function 1QS 5:6, 8:3ff, 9:4 - 6 and 1QSa 1:3. See also Paul Garnet, Salvation and Atonement in the Qumran Scrolls, Tübingen, 1977 and R.J.Daly, Origins of the Christian Doctrine of Salvation, London, 1978, who shows that the community comes to regard itself as a priest, sacrifice and temple.

36. W.D.Davies, op.cit p.235. According to Berossus, in the Babylonian Creation story, the animals are clay mingled with the blood of Marduk and so participate in the divine life.
37. So Dahl, Kurze, pp34f.
38. See notes 7 - 9.
39. E.P.Sanders, op.cit p.465, agrees with Bultmann that atonement in Paul's theology is not so much the mitigating of past disaster and cancellation of guilt, as freedom from the power of death and divine wrath and the possibility of a new life. D.E.H.Whitely op.cit pp130 - 54 sees a change of lordship.
40. A.Vanhoye, "L'Épître aux Éphésiens et L'Épître aux Hébreux", Biblica 59 (1978) 198 - 230 finds a certain affinity rather than a direct relationship, e.g. in expressions, "foundation of the world" (1:4) "enlightened" (1:18) "made with hands" (2:11) (pp216,7).
41. Schille p.26 and Dibelius, p.69 think our verses have a double tendency, i.e. in our passage both assertions are so intertwined that no clear line of thought can be traced.
42. See Barth, p.6. Th.Innitzer, op.cit 612 - 21. Penna, Proiezione, p.168. A.Alegro, "Cosmovision espacial de la promesa de salvacion en la carta a los Efesios", RivistBib 41 (1979) 187 - 92, thinks Eph 1:3 - 14/

- Eph 1:3 - 14 is a hymn. Schlier p.123 also finds a hymnic form.
43. $\psi\alpha\lambda\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$ is found in 1 Cor 14:26, Eph 5:19, Col 3:16 etc,
 $\psi\acute{\alpha}\lambda\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$ is the generic term $\psi\alpha\lambda\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$ and $\psi\acute{\alpha}\lambda\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$
 are more specific. J.A.Soggin, Introduction to the Old Testament,
 London 1976, p.363 shows that in Greek $\psi\alpha\lambda\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\nu$ is a stringed
 instrument and $\psi\alpha\lambda\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$ is a song accompanied by the
 instrument in question, i.e. lyre or harp music. R.P.Martin, op.cit
 2, p.258 suggests they were poor people and thus no musical instruments
 are mentioned in the early church.
44. See R.P.Martin, op.cit 257 and G.Delling, $\psi\acute{\alpha}\lambda\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$ TDNT 8 (1972)
 pp498 - 503.
45. See H.Gunkel, Psalmen RGG 1913, 4, cols 1927ff. One of Gunkel's 4
 major "Gattungen" in the Psalms is Hymns. Cf. Claus Westermann, The
 Praise of God in the Psalms, London 1966. Details can be found in
 Sanders, pp2f and in G.Fohrer, Introduction to the Old Testament,
 London, 1970 pp285ff. W.Zimmerli, Old Testament Theology in Outline,
 Atlanta and Edinburgh 1978, p.154. F.Crüsemann, Studien zur
 Formgeschichte von Hymnus und Danklied in Israel, Neukirchener,
 1969, pp136 - 150 has collected many parallels from the ancient
 near east to hymns of the Old Testament.
46. R.Deichgräber, Götteshymnus und Christushymnus in der frühen
 Christenheit, Untersuchungen zu Form, Sprache und Stil der
Frühchristlichen Hymnen, Göttingen, 1967 p.22. He minimizes the role
 of OT Psalms and Jewish hymns in their influence upon early Christian
 hymns (pp121ff).
47. Rom 8:34 - 5, 1 Pet 3:18 - 22. However where this them occurs in
 Eph (1:20 - 22) it is not widely regarded as a hymnic passage.
 Merkley, AMT, 119f says the passage merely has the hymnic style
 typical of Ephesians.
 Ps 8:6 seems also to have in mind "put all things under his feet".
48. cf. M.Hengel, "Christology and the Early Christian Hymns", a lecture
 delivered at the 6th International Congress on Biblical Studies at
 Oxford, 3rd April, 1978.
49. Cf. W.Bousset, Kyrios Christos, 1913, 5th ed, 1964, trans J.E.Steely
 New York 1970 pp121ff.
50. See R.P.Martin, "Aspects of Worship in the New Testament Church", VE
 1963, 6 - 32 esp. p.8.
51. Bruce, Paul p.434 says the rhythm of hymns is said to be similar
 to that of the initiation formulae used in various Mystery Cults e.g.
 the metre of Attis initiation formula, cited by Firmicus Maternus.
 De errore/

De errore profanarum religionum, 18:1.

ἐκ τυμπάνου βέβρωκα ἐκ κυμβάλου πένηκα
 γέγονα μύστης ἄττις

"I have eaten from the drum. I have drunk from the cymbal. I have become an initiate of Attis". Musical instruments were the means of ecstatic conditions being produced (cf. 2 Kings 3:15).

The Odes of Solomon have a very different format from Ephesians but very much like the Old Testament Psalms, with short lines in couplets, where the second answers or completes the first. e.g. "I will praise thee Lord, because I love Thee". (5:1). "Indeed my hope is upon the Lord and I will not fear" (5:10). Ode 17 ends "Hallelujah".

The Odes of Solomon were first known in modern times from the Coptic ms of Pistis Sophia, discovered in 1785 and called Codex Askewianus. Selections from 5 Odes were discovered in it and published in 1812.

In 1909 J.R.Harris found the Odes on his shelves in a Syrian work where they followed immediately after the Psalms of Solomon.

They had been in his possession for two years, having come from the neighbourhood of the river Tigris. In 1912 F.C.Burkitt published the discovery of an older ms which had been housed in the British Museum for 70 years and had been catalogued with the Syrian mss for 40 years. This is Codex Nitriensis which includes Odes 17:7b - 42:20. In 1955/6 the Bodmer Papyri were found to include Ode 11. = Bodmer xi.

The words "Jesus, Church, Apostle" do not occur. Bultmann sees the Odes' origin outside of Christianity and akin to original Mandæan literature. But this required treating certain passages as interpolations. J.T.Sanders thinks the idea of the Redeemer in the Odes comes from the conception of Adonis and a hypostatization of the Word, which is independent of John (p.119, cf 104f). A.Harnack, "Ein Jüdisch-christliches Psalmbuch aus dem ersten Jahrhundert", Texte und Untersuchungen 35,4 Leipzig, 1910 thought Odes 4 and 6 were Jewish and 19 and 27, Christian. H.Gunkel, "Die Oden Salomos" ZNW 11 (1910) 291 - 328 thought they were Christian. A gnostic connection is denied by J.Daniélou, "Odes de Salomonin" DB (s) 6 (1960) cols 677 - 84, (see S.S.Smalley, John Evangelist and Interpreter, Exeter 1978 pp52ff), cf. J.H.Charlesworth, "The Odes of Solomon - not Gnostic" CBQ 31 (1969) 357 - 69. He thinks the Odist is Jewish - Christian and reflects Jewish Apocalyptic mysticism. He and R.A.Culpepper in "The Odes of Solomon and the Gospel of John" CBQ 35 (1973) 298 - 322 suggest the author was a non - Qumran Essene. In The Odes of Solomon, Oxford 1973, rev./

1973, rev. Missoula 1978, Charlesworth considers them the first Christian hymnbook. H.J.W.Drijvers, "The 19th Ode of Solomon, Its interpretation and place in Syrian Christianity", J.T.S n.s 31 (1980) 320 - 36, places them in the third or fourth centuries (335). For further details see M.Lattke, Die Oden Salomos in Ihrer Bedeutung Für Neues Testament und Gnosis, Fribourg, 1 (1979) 1A (1980) II (1979).

52. W.Bousset, op.cit 306 notices the hymns to the lamb in Revelation, inspired he believes by the Eucharist.
53. R.P.Martin, N.T.Foundations 2 p.262.
54. See J.D.G.Dunn, Unity and Diversity in the New Testament, London, 1977, p.132.
55. ibid p.133, See D.R.Jones, "The Background and Character of the Lukan Psalms", JTS n.s. 19 (1968) 19 - 50, esp 47, 8. R.E.Brown, The Birth of the Messiah, New York 1977.

The Canticles are Jewish - Christian and added at the second stage of the composition of the gospel. Jewish - Christian hymns were associated with the Jewish - Christian "anawim" (poor and pious people), and have been adapted to their present use by the addition of such verses as 1:48, 76, 2:29 - 32. See D.Minguez, "Poética generativa del Magnificat", Biblica 61 (1980) 55 - 77.

56. Dunn op.cit pp133ff and 140.
57. Deichgräber, op.cit pp60ff. Chapter 2 is entitled "Der Göttes Hymnus". R.P.Martin, "New Testament Theology, A Proposal, The Theme of Reconciliation", Exp.T 91 (1979/80) 364 - 8 finds a carefully prepared piece of soteriological credo in 2 Cor 5:18,19 with complementary couplets 1a 1b 2a 2b. The thoughts are repeated in vv 20, 21 in inverse sequence 3b, 3a.
58. See N.Perrin, op.cit p.53.
59. Significant contributions have been J.Weiss, Christ the Beginning of Dogma, London 1911 pp84ff. E.Lohmeyer, Kyrios Jesus, Heidelberg, 1928 (Darmstadt 1961) says it is a pre - Pauline Christian Hymn which uses the servant of Isaiah, cf R.P.Martin, Carmen Christi, Cambridge 1967, pp118ff. E.Käsemann links with the idea of the gnostic redeemer in "A critical analysis of Phil. 2:5 - 11, God and Christ", JThC 5 (1968) 45 - 88.

K.Wengst, Christologische Formeln und Lieder des Urchristentums Gütersloh 1972 pp149 - 55 sees the heavenly man of the gnostic myth. O.Hofius, Der Christushymnus Phil 2:6 - 11, Tübingen 1976 has reasserted that it has a Jewish background rather than Hellenistic.

J.D.G.Dunn/

- J.D.G.Dunn, op.cit pp134f has tried to mediate by saying the poetic form is Hebraic but the ideas of preexistence and of twospheres is Hellenistic. Dunn calls it an unusual mesh of Hellenism and Judaism. G.Howard, "Phil 2:6 - 11 and the Human Christ", CBQ 40 (1978) 368 - 73 finds the evidence of a primitive Christology from early Jewish Christianity, referring only to the human and not the preexistent Christ as well. C.J.Robbins, "Rhetorical Structure of Philippians 2:6 - 11" CBQ 42 (1980) 73 - 82 discusses the format of the strophes and disagrees with Lohmeyer.
60. See Sanders p.75.
 61. E.Stauffer, New Testament Theology London, 1955 pp338 - 9. F.Schille, pp16 - 20 and 47 - 50 and M.Barth, pp7ff. These were inspired by E.Norden, Agnostos Theos, Berlin 1913. He found (pp250 - 4) in Col 1:15 - 20 traditional forms of predication, Jewish periods and Stoic Allmachtsformel. Cf J.Kroll, Die christliche Hymnodik bis zu Klemens Alexandria, Königsburg, 1921 and Gnomon 5 (1929) p.31, where he concluded that Christian hymns are in part like "stylized, metrical and prose religious speech of the Graeco - Roman paganism".
 62. Norden, op.cit pp202f shows that participial predications belong to the liturgical practice of Greek speaking (and writing) Jews.
 63. Barth p.8.
 64. G.Bornkamm, RGG II 1003 lines 14 - 17. The characteristics are seen particularly in Col 1:15 - 20.
 65. Fischer pp110, 11.
 66. Deichgräber, p.21.
 67. C.C.Caragounis op.cit p.40, believes that the Magnificat and the Benedictus are the nearest in format to Eph 1:3 - 14.
 68. O.Kaiser, Introduction to the Old Testament, Oxford, 1975 pp336f.
 69. Schille, p.25 thinks the "we" style in 14 and 18 distinguishes the excursus from the letter framework's "you" in 13 and 19.
 70. e.g.Haupt, Ewald, Dibelius and Conzelmann. Cited by Merklein, Tradition p.79. J.D.G.Dunn op.cit p.139 regards it as a purple passage.
 71. Schlier says these characteristics are not unknown in the other Pauline letters, but not such an accumulation (p.18). The nearest parallels he finds in the doxologies, hymns and the more dogmatic parts, reminding sometimes of 2.Thess 1:3 - 12, 1 Cor 1:4 - 8, Rom 3:21 - 26, 4:16 - 18, 9:22 - 24, 16:25 - 27, Phil 1:3 - 7, Phm 8 - 14.
 72. But not/

72. But not necessarily, for 13 is not in the excursus, whereas 18 might be.
73. Merklein, Amt, p.23 believes the author of Ephesians used material in part hymnic and liturgical (in this case passages from Colossians) to create his own hymn-like passages (cf Merklein, Tradition, p.101).
74. Details, including a chart of the various suggested hymnic content is in Benoit, L'Hymne pp230ff. See also J.M. Robinson, "A Formal analysis of Col 1:15 - 20", JBL 76 (1957) 270 - 87. (He takes greater liberties than most in rearranging the text). R.P. Martin "An Early Christian Hymn. (Col 1:15 - 20)" EQ 36 (1964) 195 - 205 and his excursus "The Literary Form and Background of Col 1:15 - 20" in Colossians and Philemon, London 1974 pp61ff. B. Vawter, "The Colossian Hymn and the Principle of Redaction", CBQ 33 (1971) 62 - 81. Deichgräber p.381 gives a list of those holding the view that it is a hymn. See also H.J. Gabathuler, Jesus Christus, Haupt der Kirche, Haupt der Welt, Zurich, 1965. The first to distinguish was E. Norden, op.cit pp250ff. See E. Schweizer, Kolosser, Zurich, 1976 pp50 - 74.
75. D. Smith, op.cit, p.34 thinks the author alludes to Is 57:19 in v.13 and then returns to it in v.17, combined with Is 52:7. Note also the occurrence of peace in v.14.
76. Merklein, Tradition, 98ff sees a small hymn fragment 14b and the use of Col 1:21 - 23a in 2:11 - 22. Surprisingly J. Gniska, Der Kolosserbrief Freiburg 1980 does not refer to Eph 2:14 - 17.
77. Norden, op.cit p.252.
78. Schlier, p.21 calls it a "Mysterienrede". Bruce, Paul, p.418 says the language "is generally recognised nowadays to be based on an early Christian hymn or confession in which Christ is celebrated as the Divine Wisdom". E. Käsemann, "A primitive Christian Baptismal Liturgy" in Essays on New Testament Themes, London, 1964 pp149 - 168, p.154 has pointed out that if we remove 8 of the 112 words, we remove every specifically Christian element.
79. E. Käsemann, ibid, p.158 thinks it is not a gnostic hymn on the reconciliation of the cosmos but about the gnostic redeemer looking for men. Käsemann therefore concludes that the idea of a gnostic redeemer was known in Judaism before Christianity (p.155). F. Festorazzi, "Coherence and Value of the O.T. in Paul's Thought" in Paul de Tarse, Apôtre, du notre temps, ed L. de Lorenzi, Rome, 1979, 165 - 173 finds the background in Prov 8:22 - 31 (Wisdom) and in Apocalyptic/

Apocalyptic (e.g. Col 1:26) p.172. E.Lohse, Colossians and Philemon, Philadelphia 1971, finds a combination of Old Testament, Oriental and Greek thought. J.Gnilka op.cit pp51 - 87 detects Logos-Sophia speculation. The author of Colossians uses the hymn because he is in sympathy with its content and can develop it further (p.76). P.Beasley-Murray, "Col 1:15 - 20 : An early Christian hymn celebrating the Lordship of Christ" in Pauline Studies Essays Presented to F.F.Bruce, ed D.A.Hagner and M.J.Harris, Exeter 1980, p.11 denies the widely accepted view of Col 1:18a originally referring to Christ as the cosmic head of the world-body. Both in the Pre-Pauline and Pauline form of the hymn, the church is the body of Christ.

80. R.P.Martin, New Testament Foundations, 2 pp266, 7.
81. E.Käsemann, "Epheser. 2:17 - 22" in Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen, (EvB) Göttingen 1960 pp 280 - 3 and "Das Interpretationsproblem des Epheserbriefes", ThLZ 86 (1961) 1 - 8, reprinted in EvB 2 (1964) pp253 - 61 and Epheser, RGG 2 517 - 20 esp col 519. E.Lohmeyer, op.cit pp40ff thinks Col 1:13 - 29 is the order of a primitive worship service. G.Bornkamm op.cit pp56 - 66 finds a eucharistic setting.
82. E.Norden begins with v.12. E.Lohmeyer op.cit has to include 13 and 14. Holtzmann op.cit p.149 begins with 14 and Käsemann ENT 153ff needs 13 - 14 as a liturgical introduction, which was added to the hymn when used as a baptismal liturgy, 16 - 17 is the introduction to the second part. Deichgräber, pp145f, takes 12 - 14 and 15 - 20 as separate units.
83. E.Schweizer, "Die Kirche als Leib Christi in den paulinischen Antilegomena", ThLZ 86 (1961) cols 241 - 56 (reprinted in Neotestamentica, Zurich and Stuttgart 1963, pp293 - 316) has (col 241) three, 15 - 16, 17 - 18a and 18b - 20. Cf, his The Church as the Body of Christ, Richmond, Virginia, 1964, pp56 - 73. So P.Beasley-Murray, op.cit, but E.Schweizer, Kolossier, Zurich 1980 p.52 has two, 15 - 18a, 18b - 20.
84. e.g. Masson, L'Épître de Saint Paul aux Colossiens, Neuchâtel, 1950 pp97 - 106. Details in Benoit L'Hymne, p.233. W.McCown, "The Hymnic Structure of Col 1:15 - 20", EQ 51 (1979) 156 - 62 tries to simplify by saying there are two verses in 15 - 20, with 17 - 18a acting as the refrain.
85. E.Norden, op.cit omits "seen and unseen, whether thrones or dominions/

- dominions or powers or rulers" and "the church".
86. So J.D.G.Dunn op.cit p.136. They are probably Pauline additions.
 87. ὁράτω and πρωτεύω but we have ὁράτω in 1.Tim 1:17, Heb 11:27 and Rom 1:20 and φιλοπρωτεύω in 3.John 9.
 88. Benoit, L'Hymne p.259. See note 78.
 89. E.Testa, "Gesu Pacificatore Universale, Inno liturgico della Chiesa madre Col 1:15 - 20 and Ef 2:14 - 16", Liber Annus 19 (1969) 5 - 64 thinks it is the third strophe of an early Jewish Christian hymn, where Col 1:15 - 17 and 18 - 20 provide the first two strophes. His title shows it concerns Jesus the universal peacemaker.
 90. See note 51 and section 4.4.4.
 91. If 14 and 17 are both in the hymn, we have inclusio, as Dahood, op.cit has found in the Psalms.
 92. Bengel, 1858 says "by the tenor of their words and kind of rythmn they resemble a song"(quasi rythmo canticum imitatur). Hymns have been found elsewhere in Ephesians see notes 47 and 127 Haupt saw an excursus.
 93. Dibelius and Conzelmann speak of a christological insertion in the form of an exegesis of Is 57:19. See note 70.
 94. Schille, pp24ff. H.Schlier CK.
 95. Schlier p.123 "ein Stuch eines uberlieferten Hymnus handelt, den der Apostel aufgenommen und interpretiert hat". The underlying layer concerns the descent and ascent of the heavenly Urmensch Redeemer. The Pauline layer views the cross as the crucial salvation event. D.Smith, op.cit p.34 shows how under the impact of criticism, Schlier has brought in a whole new area of background sources (especially Jewish) in his commentary, but not really integrated them. In one of his last works Der Geist und die Kirche, Freiburg 1980, he refers to an old Christian hymn (p.183).
 96. Schlier, 128.
 97. So J.T.Sanders p.91.
 98. Schlier pp122, 3.
 99. Schille pp24 - 31. Schlier sets the pattern for works like Schille's and P.Pokorný's and E.Käsemann's Das Interpretationsproblem des Epheserbriefes. Critics include Percy, Probleme, and "Zur den Problemen des Kolosser und Epheserbriefes" ZNW 43 (1950 - 1) 178 - 94 and F.Mussner, Christus das All und die Kirche. Studien zur Theologie des Epheserbriefes, Trier, 1955.
 100. Schille, pp24 - 31 and 50 - 52. J.T.Sanders, Hymnic Elements in Eph 1 - 3, ZNW 56 (1965) 214 - 32.
 101. See Deichgräber/

101. See Deichgräber, pp165 - 7.
102. Cf the lines suggested by Lohmeyer (op.cit). Schille's lines are too long for poetry. The sentence construction is prose style, with 14 - 16 as one long sentence. See E.Käsemann, A Primitive Christian Liturgy and note 59.
103. Merklein, Tradition, 83ff.
104. J.T.Sanders op.cit, esp p.217.
105. Sanders p.14.
106. Deichgräber, pp165f shows how "both" and "two" are related to the context.
107. J.Gnilka, "Christus unser Friede - ein Friedens Erlöserlied in Eph 2:14 - 17" in Die Zeit Jesus, Festschrift for H.Schlier, Freiburg im Breisgau, 1970 pp190 - 207.
108. Gnilka p.147.
109. Gnilka, Die Zeit Jesus, p.192
110. *ibid* p.199ff. He argues that the model Redeemer myth, irrespective of whether it is used here, is not certain. He is critical of Pokorný's parallels such as the superindividual aspect of man, the cosmic motif, the body as a sociological organism, the head, growth, see Gnilka pp36,7.
111. *ibid* p.149, Die Zeit Jesus pp199.
112. Gnilka p.148.
113. Merklein, Tradition, p.93 says the decisive argument against Gnilka must lie in the formal region.
114. G.Giavanni, "La Structure Littéraire d'Eph 2:11 - 22", NTS 16 (1969 - 70) 209 - 11. R.Penna op.cit, p.170 thinks the construction of the second part of ch.2 presents a kind of parallelism with the first part. Penna, however does not go into the details.
115. K.Wengst op.cit pp181 - 6.
116. See the discussion in P.Stuhlmacher, "Er ist unser Friede" (pp337-58) in Neues Testament und Kirche (für R.Schnackenburg) ed J.Gnilka, Herder, 1974, cited as Stuhlmacher.
117. K.M.Fischer pp131f. Note his convenient summary of his position pp200ff.
118. Lindemann pp156 - 79.
119. N.Perrin, The New Testament : An Introduction, New York 1974 p.133.
120. Kirby, pp157ff.
121. In Midrash Bemidbar Rabba 8:4 the question is asked about proselytes having a share in the building of the temple and the answer is "to inform /

inform you, that the Holy One, blessed is he, brings near those who are distant and supports the distant just as the nigh. Nay more, he gives peace to the distant sooner than to the nigh, as it says, peace to him that is far off and to him that is nigh. Is 57:19". Beare, p.601 believes the writer is a Jew because of the Semitic flavour of the style and his knowledge of rabbinical methods of exegesis which 2:13 - 17 (cf 4:8 - 9) displays.

122. Deichgräber, p.166.

123. Stuhlmacher pp347f.

124. C.Perrot, "La Lecture sinagogale d'Exode 21:1 - 22:23 et son influence sur la littérature neo - testamentaire", in A la Rencontre de Dieu, memorial to A.Gelin. Le Puy 1961 pp223 - 39 argues that the background of Eph 2:11 - 22 is the synagogue service in which the Torah reading was Ex 21:1 - 22:21 and the reading from the prophets Is 56:1 - 9 and 57:19. Ex 21:8 and 22:21 explain "strangers and sojourners".

R.Storer, "A possible link between the Epistle to the Ephesians and the Book of Ruth", *Studia Evangelica*, 4.ed.F.L.Cross, Berlin 1968 TU 102, pp343 - 46. He suggests that Ruth was one of the assigned readings in the Jewish liturgy for Pentecost. 2:11 reminds one of the bringing near of the Gentile who was far off and of two out of one (Ruth - Naomi, Ruth - Boaz). He links the wall with Ruth 4:12 and patristic exegesis on Gen 38.

While both of these writers' suggestions are possible, they are by no means convincing.

Rader, p.201 says it cannot be shown conclusively that the Jewish liturgies which appear to be relevant are earlier than Ephesians.

125. I agree with Dahl, Kurze, pp32f that its style is explained by a free unfolding and explanation of O.T.texts. B.Rigaux, op.cit p.143 says the phrases have a decided rhythm, the repetitions serve as a refrain and elements of the vocabulary suggest the idea of the liturgy. "However these elements do not constitute sufficient evidence to isolate the pericope, as if it were some type of hymn that had been reworked by the writer of Ephesians and then inserted into the epistolary context". R.Deichgräber, op.cit pp165- 7. H.Greeven, An die Kolosser, Epheser, an Philemon, Tübingen, 1953, p.69 and H.Conzelmann, op.cit 67ff, all say it is prose.

126. See Percy, Probleme, esp pp36ff.

127. See note/

127. See note 47 and C.Maurer, "Der Hymnus von Epheser 1. als Schlüssel zum ganzen Brief" 151 - 72. Th.Innitzer op.cit, finds 3 strophes of unequal length on the three members of the Trinity, 3 - 6, 7 - 12, 13 - 14. Fischer, pp114f finds three strophes of an extensively reworked hymn, 4 - 6a, 7 - 8, 13b - 14. Schlier, p.39, divides 4 - 10 into the three parts of a eulogy, 4 - 6a (ἐξελέξατο) 6b - 7 (ἐχαρίτωσεν) and 8 - 10 (ἐπερίσσευσεν). C.C.Caragounis op.cit p.38 calls 1:3 - 14 a eulogy, Gnika, p.59, calls it a "hymnische Sprache" similar to the Qumran Hodayoth. Schille, pp67 - 69 finds a hymnic "Vorlage". A.Suski, "Eulogia w liscie do Efezjan", Studia Theologica Varsaviansia (Warsaw) 16 (1978) 19 - 48, finds in 1:3 - 14 a liturgical hymn like Qumran (3 - 10) (and the Psalms of Solomon) which has been expanded (11 - 14) for a baptismal setting. (A summary is given in NTA23 (1979) 212). But R.Schnackenburg Die grosse Eulogie Eph 1:3 - 14, BZ 21 (1977) 67 - 87 denies that it is hymnic. The cultic thesis is considered sympathetically for Eph 2:20 - 22 by F.Mussner op.cit pp111-18, Dibelius p.64, Schille, p.55 and H.Sahlin, Die Beschniedung Christi, "Eine Interpretation von Eph 2:11 - 22", Symbolae Uppsaliensis 12 (1950) pp1 - 22. Further details are found in Lamadrid 1:256ff.

NOTES FOR CHAPTER FOUR

1. The hymnic passage in this verse is introduced by $\delta\iota\omicron$ not by $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$.
2. It is possible that $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ can refer forward and the passage be translated "He is our peace, therefore he has made both one". An example of such a construction is Rom 6:5ff. But here it is not the simplest possibility, so the other more usual interpretation is preferred.
3. If the passage were a hymn, it would refer to whatever person the citation had in mind, such as the Father or the gnostic Redeemer.
4. For $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\omega}$ see D.Schenkel , Epheser, Philipper, Kolosser, (Lange) Bielefeld, 1862 and Ewald. Most, naturally, see the nearer $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon$ as being the antecedent.
5. Compare Mt 1:21, Col 1:17, 18 and $\eta\rho\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ in Eph 2:3, $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ can be written and not be emphatic e.g. Lk 5:1. Haupt (p.77) shows "he" is stressed, since it is repeated 5 times more in 14 - 18.
6. So F.Mussner, "Eph 2 als ökumenisches Modell", p.329 in Neues Testament und Kirche ed. J.Gnilka, Herder, 1974 pp325 - 336. M.Klemm, op.cit p.40, = In Col 1:15 - 20, Christ's work is in the passive here it is active.
7. Cf. 2:20, $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ would in early mss have no breathing, so it could mean "himself". But if this is the case, we usually have another word e.g. $\theta\varsigma$ cf 1.Pet 2:24. C.F.D.Moule op.cit p.119 shows it is always a matter of conjecture when to read $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu$ and when $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu$ since breathings are seldom put on by the earlier hands in mss. In Col 1:20 $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu$ has to be translated $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu$ to distinguish from previous $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu$ which refers to God. Ewald thinks $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ is not in apposition to $\rho\omicron\iota\eta\sigma\alpha\varsigma$ but is the predicate, "then, even he is the peace for us, who having made the two one etc, and having come preached peace". This removes the chronological problem in v.17.
8. So Beet. But it is strange that John never has "I am peace", although he speaks of Christ giving peace and of "my peace" (14:27). H.Rendtorff, Der Brief an die Epheser, Göttingen 1949 p.66 says Jesus is the peace and brings the peace.
9. Lamadrid 1:224.
10. So Gnilka p.138. Salmond translates as "He in his own person". Schille p.27 shows that already in Greece, there is a personification of peace. Peace is often the predicate of a deity (see G.Pauly-Wissowa, Real-Enzyklopädie der classischen Altertums-Wissenschaft, vol.X, 2128ff). In late/

In late Judaism, God and the Messiah are so predicated (Philo De Somn 2:253, SB 3:587). Christ has the title because he creates peace as 15b clearly shows.

Hesiod's Theogony personified peace in a series of Greek divinities, Irene, the daughter of Zeus and sister of Eunomia (order) and Dikē (legal order).

11. Alford.
12. Gaugler. Calvin finds a reference to preaching and in this he shows an insight into its rhetorical style, which has only been fully investigated this century.
13. Meyer.
14. Gnllka = "dass der Friede an ihn gebunden ist". Cf the "I am's" in John's Gospel.
15. Schlir p.122 "er enthalt sozusagen das Generalthema des Abschnittes".
16. Zerwick p.64. Cf his "He is our peace Eph 2:11 - 18", Bibleshyam 1 (1975) 302 - 16.
17. Cf Lk 1:79 and 2:14.
18. Haupt understands a reference to Christians in a general sense. J.J.Meuzelaar, op.cit p.55 says "we" = Jews and "you" = Gentiles, but "we" can sometimes include Gentiles (2:18, 4:7, 13ff).
19. Schlir would agree with this (p.124) but insists (p.106) that 2:3, as in 1:11f refers to Jewish Christians only, since they alone previously had the blessings of chapter 1, whilst Gentiles were strangers to the covenant.
20. See D.Jayne, "We" and "You" in Ephesians 1:3 - 14", Exp.T 85 (1973 - 4) 151 - 2, and Penna Proiezione, p.168 1:3 - 12 = We Christian Jews. 1:13 = You Gentile Christians.
21. R.A.Wilson, "We and you in the Epistle to the Ephesians", Studia Evangelica 11, pt.1 ed, F.L.Cross, Berlin, 1964, pp676 - 80 has argued that in Ephesians "we" refers to all Christians and "you" to recently baptized converts. D.Smith, op.cit p.54 thinks this viewpoint will not stand the test of examination.
22. Cf. Schlir, p.124.
23. Schlir p.125 says it is because of three things, the breaking of the dividing wall, making two spheres one and overcoming the emnity through his flesh. We need not go as far as Percy, Probleme pp282 - 3 who says that the passage only speaks of peace because the quotation from Isaiah prompts the idea. Penna, Paix, believes peace in Eph 2:14 is the fruit of the cross in removing the division between Jew and Gentile/

Gentile in their integration in the ecclesial society, p.194.

24. Meyer p.127.
25. E.Haupt, pp74ff thinks it impossible that concepts peace and enmity can mean one thing one moment and be another the next. No reader could come to the thought that enmity of v.16 is different from v.14 and that making peace in 15 is different from 14a. The change of meaning would be clear and that is not the case. "Both" shows Jew and Gentile. The enmity is between them and God (p.77). They are reconciled to God and have access to the Father.
26. Proposed by F.D.Coggan, "A note on Eph 2:14" Exp.T. 53 (1941) 242.
27. See the critique of Coggan's view in N.Snaith, "Further note on Eph 2:14", *ibid* 325 - 6.
28. "Readiness" is preferable to "preparation". See Abbott. Cf Is 52:7.
29. Robinson.
30. Augustine, Ambrose (Latin, *euens se*), Origen, Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia (details can be found in J.B.Lightfoot, Colossians and Philemon, 1879 (reprinted Grand Rapids 1957, pp189) and in C.F.D. Moule, Colossians and Philemon, Cambridge 1957, pp99ff, who says it means "divested himself of the rulers and authorities").
31. Jerome wrote "exspolians".
32. J.J.Meuzelaar *op.cit* p.108, cites Abbott, Wikenhauser, S.Hanson and Thornton for the view that the peace of Col 1:21ff does not refer to a harmony of the universe.
33. Calvin succinctly combines the two aspects of peace by saying (on 2:17) "the Gospel is the message of peace by which God declared himself favourable to us . . . the proper effect of the Gospel is to give peace and calmness to the conscience". Cf Phil 4:7 with the Aaronic blessing in Numbers 6:24 - 26.
34. H.Roux, "Peace" in J.J.von Allmen, The Vocabulary of the Bible, London 1958, pp319 - 21.
35. H.Ridderbos, *op.cit* pp182ff. H.Schlier, "Der Friede nach dem Apostol Paulus" in Der Geist und die Kirche, Freiburg 1980, 117 - 133 accepts Ephesians as Pauline, He therefore treats Eph 2:14 as integral to the Pauline doctrine and discusses it on pp124ff.
36. Details of the Greek usage of peace are in Gnilka, W.Foerster, TDNT 2:400 - 402 and 406 - 20, H.Beck and C.Brown in NIDNTT 2.776 - 83, W.E.Caldwell, Hellenic Conceptions of Peace, New York 1919, E. de W.Burton, Galatians, Edinburgh 1921 pp424 - 6, H.Fuchs, "Augustin und der/

und der Antike Friedensgedanke" NPHU 3 (1926) 39 - 43 and 167 - 223. E.Lohmeyer, "Probleme paulinische Theologie" ZNW 26 (1927) 158 - 73. W.Klassen, "A child of Peace (Luke 10:6) in First Century Context" NTS 27 (1980 - 1) 488 - 506 notices how the topic of peace has received scrutiny from the standpoint of the ancient Orient and the Old Testament, but little investigation from the Greek world. The Greek understood peace as the antonym to war and disturbed conditions (1.Cor 14:33, Rom 14:19, 5:1).

The following works deal more with the eastern background : H.Gross, Die Idee des ewigen und allgemeinen Weltfriedens im Alten Orient und in Alten Testament, Trier, 1956. H.H.Schmidt, Shalom-"Frieden" im Alten Orient und im Alten Testament, Stuttgart, 1971. O.H.Steck, Friedensvorstellungen im alten Israel, Zurich 1972. G.Zampaglione, The Idea of Peace in Antiquity, Notre Dame, Indiana, 1973, pp17ff.

M.Klemm op.cit pp69ff gives details of recent literature on the subject of peace in the New Testament. Penna, Paix, p.180 shows that in Greek and Latin, it can be something which does not touch the foundation of the man.

37. Although the LXX occasionally translates shalom by other words (e.g. for greetings) εἰρήνη is used in the majority of cases. In some 15 passages εἰρήνη corresponds to other Hebrew words meaning safety, freedom etc. Four meanings found for it in the LXX are prosperity, greeting, ethical good and reconciliation with men. See W.S.van Leeuwen, Eirene in Het Nieuwe Testament, Wageningen, 1940.
38. Exceptions are Gen 26:31 and 43:23. See NIDNTT 2.777. TDNT 2.408.
39. Cf. G.von Rad, on 'shalom' being a very rich word, "There is hardly a word like it that can bear a common use and yet can also be filled with a concentrated religious content far above the level of the average conception", (TDNT 2:402).
40. Cf. Lamadrid 3.266, M.Klemm op.cit pp64ff. Greek literature shows a warlike tendency characteristic of the people. But the word εἰρήνη came to be used for σπουδαί . E.Brandenburger, Frieden im neuen Testament, Gütersloh, 1973 summarizes the various emphases of the N.T.writers, e.g. eschatological (the peace which the Messiah brings) and cosmic (overcoming of demonic forces through the cross and exaltation of Christ).
41. W.Foerster, TDNT 2.411ff.
42. Bibliographies of works on שָׁלוֹם can be found in TDNT, NIDNTT, J.Westerman/

J.Westermann, Theologisches Handwörterbuch zum AT, Band 2, Munich and Zurich, 1971 BDB p.1022 and J.Pedersen, Israel 1 - 11 Oxford 1926 pp311ff. See G.E.Wright, The Challenge of Israel's Faith, London, 1946 p.94, he links peace in the Old Testament with covenant.

43. See BDB.
44. G.von Rad, op.cit.
45. Gnllka, G.von Rad op.cit.
46. D.Gillett, "Shalom : Content for a Slogan", Themelios, 1(1976) 80-4, citing von Rad op.cit p.406, claims that in the Old Testament, it nowhere denotes the specifically spiritual aspect of inward peace. Cf Lam 3:17 and R.Penna op.cit p.177. But the texts we have cited show this is not true, although it is a fuller term in the New Testament.
47. Cf Rev 21 and 22, Lamadrid 3.239, 40.
48. See A.R.Johnson, Sacral Kingship in Ancient Israel, Cardiff, 1955.
49. Acc to O.Michel, Der Brief an die Hebräer, Göttingen, 1966, p.559.
50. A.S.van der Woude, "Melchisedek als himmlische Erlösergestalt in den neugefundenen eschatologischen Midraschim aus Qumran Hohle XI", Oudtestamentische Studien 14, Leiden, 1965, p.357 assigns it to the years AD 1 - 50.
51. Cf Pss 81:1, 2. For recent work on Melchizedek see M.de Jonge and A.S.van der Woude, "IIQMelch and the New Testament", NTS 12 (1965-6) 301 - 26 and F.L.Horton Jr. The Melchizedek Tradition, Cambridge 1976.
52. The theology of the Holy War is defined in Deut 32. Possible Old Testament references are Ex 17:15 - 16, Num 10:35 (cf Ugarit III ABA 5, J.B.Pritchard, ed, Ancient Near Eastern Texts relating to the Old Testament, "Ugarit", trans H.L.Ginsberg, Princeton, 1969, p.131). Num 21:14, Jos 7, 1.Sam 10:22, 15:1 - 3, 17:39. It is uncertain whether the concept begins in the Egyptian captivity (see R.de Vaux, The Early History of Israel, London, 1978, p.383, or in the Amphictyony (G.von Rad, Studies in Deuteronomy, (trans D.Stalker, London, 1953 pp45 - 59). However many scholars dispute the existence of an Israelite Amphictyony, (A.D.H.Mayes, Israel in the period of the Judges, London 1974).

For non-Israelite parallels to the Holy War see H.Gunkel, Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit, Göttingen 1895, H.M.Cross, Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic, Cambridge, Mass, 1973.

If the concept was not utilized during the monarchy (J.L.Mackenzie, The Theology/

The Theology of the Old Testament, London 1974 p.151, it may be found in Apocalyptic themes (see P.D.Hanson, The Dawn of Apocalyptic, Philadelphia 1975, p.12ff, Ez 38, Zech 2:1 - 4) and Qumran (IQM II-IX see P.R.Davies, IQM, The War Scroll From Qumran. Its Structure and History, Rome 1977).

53. Origen, Comm. Cant., 11 quotes Eph 2:14, when he discusses Solomon as a type of Christ.
54. See D.C.Duling, "The Therapeutic Son of David", NTS 24 (1977 - 8) 392 - 410. For details of the Messianic concept see J.Klausner, The Messianic Idea in Israel, London, 1956 and F.Hahn, The Titles of Jesus in Christology, London, 1969, pp136ff. J.Gnilka, Kolossar, p.74 connects Col 1:20 with Micah 5:5 and Is 9:5ff.
55. N.Sraith op.cit pp325 - 6.
56. So G.Rice, "A neglected interpretation of the Immanuel Prophecy", ZAW 90 (1978) pp220 - 7.
57. J.Bright, "Isaiah", in Peake's Commentary of the Bible, Oxford 1962, p.497.
58. So F.Delitzsch, Isaiah, Edinburgh, 1890 en loc. The word mighty (גִּבּוֹר) is found in Ps 24:8, Dt 10:17, Prov 30:30. Yahweh's might brings war to an end and so brings in the Messianic age of peace. Cf Zech 9:10, Micah 5:4, 5. Before the fall of Jerusalem (BC587) the false prophets were predicting a false peace. After the fall of Jerusalem the promise of peace is the central message of the prophets, e.g. Deutero-Isaiah. Yahweh had previously withheld the gift in judgement (Jer 12:12, 14:19, 16:5, 25:37).
59. Rashi, Ki, cf The Targum. See G.B.Gray, Isaiah, Edinburgh 1912, pp172f for a critique of this view.
60. R.Jose the Galilean, "Great is the peace when the King the Messiah is revealed to Israel, he will bear the peace, according as it is written "How beautiful". (Is 52:7, SB 3.par 587). J.Gnilka op.cit p.74, thinks Col 1:20 has it in mind. He also cites the High Priest Hanaja, cir A.D.70, who said "Great is the peace when the work of creation is restored".
61. Cf D.Seccombe, "Luke and Isaiah" NTS 27 (1980 - 1) 252 - 9, B.Lindars, "The Place of the O.T. in the formation of N.T. Theology", Prolegomena" NTS 23 (1977) 59 - 66 says the N.T. writers had no interest in the meaning of the O.T. for its own sake but simply quarried texts to support and illustrate a pre-existing N.T. theology.
E.Dinkler, Eirene, Der urchristliche Friedensgedanke, Heidelberg, 1973 believes/

believes the idea of peace in the primitive church was formed by the Hebrew concept of Shalom.

62. See E. Levine, "The Hebrew Treatise on Peace", *Augustinianum*, 14(1974) 147 - 71, who argues that *Pereq Salom*, 7th century AD, consists of early citation, including Palestinian sources dating from the first centuries of the Christian era. This could take us back to the time of Ephesians.
63. Details of Rabbinic writings are found in SB, E. Schürer, The History of the Jewish People in the age of Jesus Christ, Edinburgh, 1885 pp168ff and revised 1979 2.pp337 - 80. See indices of The Talmud ed I. Epstein, London 1935ff and The Mishnah ed H. Danby, Oxford, 1933. W. Foerster TDNT 2:408ff, says Rabbinic literature develops the new idea of the relationship between man and God as being one of conflict and hostility. This enmity needs to become Shalom, so the godward dimension of the relation of Shalom is emphasized more than it is in the Old Testament.
The peace of the Messianic age is specifically limited to Israel. Tanch(Duber) X V J 25 (cited SB 3.592) says "God is in conflict with all flesh, which conflict (ג'ר) remains until the making of the tabernacle which brings peace".
64. For a discussion of this passage, see R. Gordis, "Increasing peace in the world. A note on a Talmudic Passage", *JQR* 67 (1976 - 7) 44 - 6. Cf. *Tamid* 32b and Hillel's maxim "Be of the disciples of Aaron, loving peace, pursuing peace and loving human creatures".
(M. Aboth 1:12)
65. H. H. Rowley, The Relevance of Apocalyptic, London, 1963, (originally 1944) p.15 stresses the close link with prophecy. He and D. S. Russell, The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic, London, 1964 pp20ff regard apocalyptic and legalistic Judaism as two streams of Jewish thought not necessarily antagonistic to each other. R. H. Charles, The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in English, Oxford, 1913, vol.2. p.vii, also believed that prior to AD 70, they were not essentially antagonistic.
G. F. Moore, op.cit i, pp125 - 127 regarded Judaism as out of sympathy with apocalyptic writings, which is why they are ignored in the Tannaitic Literature.
W. D. Davies, op.cit, p.10 would take a mediating position between these two views.
66. Margaret Barker/

66. Margaret Barker, "Slippery Words.3.Apocalyptic", Exp.T 89 (1978/9) 324-9.
67. See F.F.Bruce, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and Early Christianity", BJRL 49 (1966/7) 69 - 90.
68. K.G.Kuhn, "Der Epheserbrief im Lichte der Qumrantexte", NTS 7 (1961) pp334 - 46 (ET in Paul and Qumran ed J.Murphy-O'Connor, London, 1968 pp1f) claims that the parallels with Ephesians are much more numerous than Schlier (60ff) suggests. Gnilka p.28 thinks Eph 5:8 is close to Qumran. IQS 3:10 has "sons of light" cf IQS 10:21 - 23. J.E.Wood, "Pauline Studies and the Dead Sea Scrolls", Exp.T 78 (1967) 308 - 11 says "similarities are striking and indicate a common heritage". J.Murphy-O'Connor, "Who wrote Ephesians?" The Bible Today 1 (1965) 1201 - 9 thinks the amanuensis must have been a converted Essene. P.Benoit, "Qumran et le Nouveau Testament", NTS 7 (1960-1) 270 - 96 says the only explanation for the similarity is that either Paul or a disciple who was entrusted under his direction with the final redaction of the epistle had a firsthand knowledge of the writings of Qumran. But if Qumran ideas have been used, the meaning has been changed.
F.Mussner, "Contributions made by Qumran to the understanding of the Epistle to the Ephesians", (Paul and Qumran ch 8) 159 - 178, originally in Neutestamentliche Aufsätze, Festschrift für J.Schmid is convinced of parallels with Eph 2, e.g. IQS 11:7f, 8:4 - 10, 6:25 - 27. IQH 11:8b - 14, IQH 3:19 - 23. Colossians also appears to have links. Bruce, Paul, p.415, cites W.D.Davies "Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls, Flesh and Spirit", in K.A.Stendahl, The Scrolls and the New Testament, 157ff esp 166f. See chapter two, note 64.
69. Cf IQPes Hab 5:4 "into the hands of his elect will God give judgement on all nations".
70. But even if Ephesians is opposed to an earthly idea of war, the writer uses it metaphorically in ch.6. This has parallels in IQM 4:1f and 15:6 and IQS 3:13 - 4:26. IQM is a theological writing rather than simply a war manual. (G.Vermes, The Dead Sea Scrolls in English, London 1962, p.123).
71. 'Εἰρηήνη often accompanied by ἡσυχία as an explanatory concept e.g. Plato, Rep.9:575b, 'Εἰρηήνη has this sense in Prov 17:1 and Is 14:30
72. Several Stoic philosophers were born in Tarsus. Antipater, Archedemus, Athenodorus son of Sandon, Nestor, Athenodorus, Cordylion, and in the nearby/

the nearby town of Soli, two of the greatest, Chrysippus and Aratus. See W.Barclay, The Mind of St. Paul, London and Glasgow, 1958 p.25, citing Strabo.

73. For Stoic influence on Christianity see E.Hatch, The Influence of Greek Ideas and Usages upon the Christian Church, London, 1890, p.168.
74. During the civil war, the Romans longed for peace and Octavian gave impetus to the people's hope. Vergil's 4th Eclogue referred to the expectations widely held in the east that a child sent from heaven would bring a new era. The citizens saw this being fulfilled in Octavian and greeted his rule as a marvel of divine manifestation. Cf Vergil, *The Aeneid* 6:851 - 53 "tu regere imperio populos, Romane, memento (hae tibi erunt artes) pacique imponere morem, parcere subjectis et debellare superbos". Remember thou O Roman, to rule to the nations with thy sway - these shall be thine arts - to crown peace with law, to spare the humble and to tame in war the proud. Cf Horace, *Carmen Seculare* 56f. The arch of Augustan peace was erected in Rome in 13-9 BC. See G.Zampaglione op.cit pp135, 152 - 5.
75. Epictetus Disc. 3:13.9, ὁπάτε γάρ ὅτι εἰρήνην μεγάλην. He was aware that Roman rule had brought peace and absence of battles and that travel was safe, even though Caesar cannot give peace from troubles. The Apologist Athenagoras. (Leg.1:2) begins by referring to the gentle and mild nature of their emperors, their peaceableness and humanity towards all, resulting in profound peace for the empire. See R.M.Grant, Early Christianity and Society, Glasgow, 1978. In the funeral discourse Antony called Julius Caesar εἰρηνοποιός (Dio Cassius 44:492). It was a current thing to define the people not subject to the emperor as "gentes non pecatae" (cf Penna Paix p.181). Tacitus saw the Augustan peace as a mixed blessing. The Romans by allowing such power to Augustus showed that they preferred safety to freedom. The value of that peace deteriorated under Tiberius and Nero. See I.C.Brown, "Tacitus and a space for freedom", *History Today*, 31 (1981) April, 11 - 15.
76. Suetonius, Life of Augustus, 28:2 (in The Life of the Caesars, cir 121AD).
77. K.S.Latourette, A History of the Expansion of Christianity, Exeter, 1970 vol.1p.14.
78. Eusebius, HE 4:26.5-11. W.Klassen, op.cit p.488 shows that "unless we pay considerable attention to the social context in which Christianity emerged we shall always have only a fragmentary understanding of the early church and its perception of peace."
79. M.Grant/

79. M. Grant, Nero London, 1970 esp pp223. A similar monument had been credited to Octavian on the Field of Mars in 9BC. See G. Zampaglione op.cit p.156.
80. The tradition that Paul was released after Acts 28, (Eusebius HE 2:22), may come from an attempt to harmonise the Pastorals with Acts.
81. Tacitus, Annals 12:19, Bellorum egregios fines, quotiens ignoscendo transigatur. The noblest end of war was a settlement reached by pardon.
82. Ewald cites Hofmann for the view that it is a participle attached to a predicate in the sense of an explanatory clause.
83. Salmond.
84. Cf E. Best, p.152.
85. Clement, Exc ex Theod 36:1. This work is a collection of sayings from Valentinians, including Theodotus. Clement supplies his own comments.
86. F. Mussner, Christus das All, p.81 thinks the neuter is motivated by $\epsilon\upsilon$ but the masculine $\epsilon\upsilon\alpha$ could have been used in 14 as in 15.
87. Schlier p.124 CK pp23f. P. Pokorný 183f shows how in CH4:6 "things mortal and things divine" are called not only $\acute{\alpha}\rho\phi\omicron\tau\epsilon\rho\alpha$ but also $\delta\upsilon\omicron$
88. Since this word in the New Testament is plural, it is not certain whether it is masculine or neuter.
89. Gnllka p.139, "Darauf war schon in v11 gelenkt, v15 macht die Einheit der Völker-gruppen als die zentrale Idee überdeutlich". Schille sees the neuter as referring to spheres. The complementary concept is $\tau\alpha\ \acute{\upsilon}\nu\epsilon\sigma\omicron\upsilon\tau\alpha$ Cf. H. Odeberg, The View of the Universe in the Epistle to the Ephesians, 1934. Schille p.28 shows that what was between God and the world is developed in the sphere of the church i.e. Jews and Gentiles. Dibelius understands enmity between God and man Rom 5:10, 8:7, Jew and Gentile. The two are interwoven.
90. Thales, Anaximander, Anaximanes, Heraclitus, Pythagoras, Plato and Stoic writers. D. Smith p.36 cites examples. But the large amount of non-gnostic material he lists (36ff) includes much of doubtful relevance, since there is little in common beyond the fact of a diversity becoming a unity. This is such a vast field of reference that other criteria are needed to show there is a connection with Ephesians. e.g. Plato Timaeus 31b,c on creation, where God made the universe to consist of fire and earth (representing the visible and tangible).
91. E. Pax/

91. E.Pax, "Stilistische Beobachtungen an neutralen Redewendungen im NT" Liber Annuus 17 (1967) 335 - 47, shows that New Testament authors use neuter or pronouns, adjectives and abstract constructions to summarize and condense in a phrase the various aspects of the different salvation acts.
 92. Lamadrid, 1:226 mentions 10 NT examples.
 93. Cf Abbott "It is simply an instance of the neuter being used of persons in a general sense".
 94. Cf Xenophon, Anab 7:3:11, τὰ φεύγοντα καὶ ἀποδιδράσκοντα (all that flees and hides).
 95. In 3:15 we have the feminine πατρίᾳ cf 2:21 οἰκοδομή Barth p.263 thinks it is perhaps the abstract metonyms, the uncircumcision / the circumcision which influenced his diction, although these are feminine in Greek.
 96. So Lamadrid 1:227. Masson = to insist on a characteristic - their duality. Cf B1, Debr 138:1.
 97. Westcott.
 98. As implied in Rom 11:17 - 24. The metaphor of a tree does not appear in Ephesians. Growth is that of a body, not a plant. (cf plantation in Qumran CD 8:5. S.T.Bloomfield suggests, μέρη or γένη. The Greek Testament with English Notes, London 1839.
 99. 3:6 ἔθνη leads to a long list of neuters, συνκληρονόμα σύνσωμα, συνμέτοχα
 100. For parallels to this use of πλήρωμα see note 85.
 101. Cf. W.Bousset op.cit p.367 who cites Clement Strom 6.5.41 that Christians are the third race, and Foulkes. "Gentiles do not simply rise to the status of Jews but both become something new and greater". E.Stauffer op.cit p.196 thinks that the many differences between one people and another are not blotted out but on the contrary they are rather made use of (Gal 3:28, Eph 2:15f) Stauffer ibid, relates to the reversal of Babel, when the nations were divided by language (cf Pentecost). "His purpose and desire is to break up the company of vice, to make her agreement of none effect, to do away with her fellowship, to annihilate and destroy her powers". (Philo, De Conf Ling, 193).
- But this is confusion rather than separation. Philo continues (197) "When these are scattered, those who have been living in exile for many a day under the ban of folly's tyranny, shall receive their recall under a single proclamation, even the proclamation erected and ratified/

and ratified by God". Philo is saying that the dispersion of the wicked will imply the reassembling of the good, who had been dispossessed.

Paul might appear inconsistent in insisting he was a Jew and yet saying there was a new people of God. W.D.Davies, "Paul and the People of Israel", NTS 24 (1977 - 8) pp4 - 39 sees inconsistency. But Paul did recognise the paradoxical nature of the Christian who is in the heavenlies with no distinction and yet on earth with a nationality and tempted to steal and be angry. He does not go as far as John, who says Jews are children of the devil (8:44).

102. R.Scott, "Eph 2:14. He is our peace, who made BOTH ONE", Exp.T 2 (1890 - 1) 106 says mankind divided the world into two types. Actually it was the Jews who did this.
103. Chrysostom, Ephesians Homily 5. Cf Augustine Contra Faustum Book xii.24.
104. This unification is called a mystery in Eph 3:3 - 6 (cf Rom 11:25, Gal 1:12, 16). A secret as a divine plan now revealed is an essential ingredient of Jewish apocalyptic, where the word *raz* is used in a technical way for God's ultimate purpose revealed through a great historical figure. (See A.E.Harvey "The use of Mystery Language in the bible", JTS n.s 31 (1980) 320 - 36, cf Tobit 12:7, Test Zeb 1:6 R.E.Brown, The Semitic Background of the term Mystery in the New Testament, Philadelphia 1968.) In the writings of Qumran, the written text of the prophet is called the Raz. The Peshet or revelation was provided by the Teacher in his explanation of the text. The original Greek word has the idea of incomprehensibility which C.C.Caragounis, op.cit 1ff insists is the meaning of the word mystery throughout the New Testament, except possibly Rev 1:20. But in 1.Cor 15:51 it means the revelation of something not known before. F.C.Synge, Ephesians, London, 1954 pp74,75 insists that mystery has the same meaning in Ephesians as in Paul.
105. Bruce, Paul, p.439.
106. Ez 37:15 - 28 cf Jer 23:6, 33:14, Hos 12:1 - 6, Is 11:13 - 14, Mic 2:12, Zech 9:10. Cf The Chronicler who regarded the north as an integral part of the kingdom. e.g. 2.Chron 30:5. See H.E.M.Williamson, Israel in the Book of Chronicles, Cambridge 1977. D.Smith op.cit p.36 notices that SB cite no Rabbinic references for the overcoming of duality.
107. JL Mackenzie, op.cit p.294 shows that the nations still have to go to the Jews/

the Jews to find Christ.

108. *ibid*, cf, W.Vogels, "L'Égypte mon peuple. L'Universalisme d'Is 19:16 - 25", *Biblica* 57 (1976) pp494 - 514 who points out that most regard it as one of the most outstanding passages for universalism in the Old Testament. He compares (p.514) Amos 1 - 2 9:7b and Ez 29:1 - 12. Cf Zech 8:23 and Mal 1:11. Joyce Baldwin, Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi London, 1972 argues (*ad loc*) that the latter text is prophetic rather than syncretistic. "Have we not all one father" (Mal 2:10) refers to Jews.
109. J.Giblet "Mysterium Dei" in *epistolis captivitatis*", *Coll Mech* 44 (1959) 263 - 65 thinks Paul shows his originality by utilizing this apocalyptic terminology for his theology of the world evolving according to God's will.
110. e.g. Caragounis *op.cit* pp134f, who notes that the Danielic mysterion is likewise eschatological, has cosmic dimensions and is a unified plan.
111. Philo, *De Vita Mosis*, 2:20.
112. G.Bornkamm, Paul, London, 1971 p.7.
113. K.W.Clark, The Gentile Bias and other essays, Leiden, 1980, "The Gentile Bias in Matthew" 1 - 8, says Matthew is strongly partisan, favouring the Gentile and renouncing the Jew (7, 8). He was persuaded that the Christian gospel originally delivered to the Jews had been rejected by them as a people, that God had now turned his back on Judaism and chosen the largely Gentile Christianity. The two strains in his gospel reflect these two stages in God's plan to save his chosen people. But the assurance that the Gentiles have displaced the Jews is the basic message and the Gentile bias of Matthew.
114. Romans 11:17 - 24, J.Munck, Paul and the Salvation of Mankind, Chatham 1959, argues that Paul's Gentile mission is not simply for the Gentiles but to make Israel jealous. For recent interest in the status of Israel and the mission to the Gentiles see B.Rigaux *op.cit* p.165 and E.P.Sanders, *op.cit* pp487ff and chapter two, note 74
115. See K.Stendahl, Paul among Jews and Gentiles, p.1, Cf The Epistle to the Romans.
116. Cf. Stendahl *op.cit* pp1, 78, 132 (supported by E.P.Sanders *op.cit* pp488ff). G.Bornkamm, *op.cit* pp88 - 96 says Romans must be interpreted in the light of Paul's ministry and not on the basis of guesses about conflicts among Christians.
117. e.g. Abbott. Zerwick "eo quod" Analysis Philologia (cited Lamadrid 1:227)/

- 1:227) translates as a gerund "pulling down" in so much that he pulled down".
118. Ch.Masson translates as "et cela" "en" "with a view to that".
119. e.g. 1:7, 8, 13, 17, 18, 2:3 and 15 (but not *δύρασι*).
The rule is not observed in 1:3 and 14. See C.F.D.Moule Idiom, p.114 and TFM.Middleton, The Doctrine of the Greek Article 1841 p.36 Philo is the only prose writer to violate the rule. But the governing noun can be anarthrous without necessitating the mission of the article with the governed. For a discussion of the use of the article see E.C.Colwell, A definite Rule for the use of the article in the Greek New Testament, JBL 52 (1933) pp12 - 21, he shows for example that definite predicate nouns regularly have the article and that exceptions are mainly due to change in word order.
120. In the New Testament *τοῖχος* is only found in Acts 23:3, *μέσος* in Mt 25:6, 2.Thess 2:7, Col 2:14 etc but not in Ephesians.
121. *Φραγμός* in the LXX often has the meaning of protection. Is 5:5 (*ⲡⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛ*) Ecclus 36:30, Mt 21:33.
122. e.g. Ignatius Trall 9:4 long rec. Eusebius H.E.I: 13:20.
123. Athenaeus, Deipnosophistae 7.2.81. Athenaeus was a native of Egypt who lived in Rome at the end of the second century and beginning of the third. His work is the oldest cookery book and refers to Eratosthenes' comment on the Stoic Aristion adopting a luxurious mode of life. The text means "many a time before this have I caught him in the act of digging through the wall, which divides pleasure from goodness and popping up on the side of pleasure".
124. BCH 33 (1909) p.452 no 22:16 + Abhandlungen der Berliner Ak.d Wissensch (=ABA) 1911 56 line 13, respectively.
125. P.Amh 11.98.8f.
126. See J.H.Moulton and G.Milligan, The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament, London 1930 p.400.
127. Josephus Ant 14:262 - 264 mentions a decree of toleration by the Ephesians towards Jews in the time of Antipater. The nearest connection of Josephus with the letter of Ephesians is possibly C.Apion 2:131 where Josephus refers to the burning of the temple in Ephesus, *τὸν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ ναόν*.
128. Polybius 9:41.1.
129. e.g. Homer, Iliad 12:263 *οἶγε ῥίνοισι βοῶν φράξαντες ἐπάλλξεις* "but closed up the battlements with bulls' hides. Cf 2.Cor 11:10.
130. It is so used in Herodotus, Sophocles etc (See AG) Homer speaks of "the fence/

- "the fence (ἔρκος) of the teeth" meaning a wall and rampart, within which is the inner man, who has fallen. Iliad 4:350 Is 5:2, Mk 12:1, Lk 14:23. Cf Proverbs 28:4, Shepherd Hermas, Parables 9:26,4.
131. J.C.K. Hofmann op.cit, φραγμός means that which surrounds something marking it off from what is outside. The word μεσότοιχον means that which divides into two parts.
132. So Chrysostom, Harless. Cf Clement of Alexandria, Strom, 6:13.
133. So Masson.
134. Abbott, Haupt p.77n3 says φραγμοῦ is the genitive of apposition as σημεῖον περιστορῆς in Rom 4:11.
135. Ellicott thinks it is neither a genitive of the characterising quality the middle wall which separated (τὸ διαρίσον) the Greek from the Jew) nor a genitive of identity "the middle wall which was, or formed the φραγμός (Meyer) but either a genitive of origin (Chrys2) or still more simply a common possessive, "the wall which belonged to the fence".
136. Percy, Probleme, p.186 gives the examples of 1:5, 11, 19, 2:2, 14, 3:7 and 6:10.
137. e.g. 4:16, διὰ πάσης ἀφῆς τῆς ἐπιχορηγίας
138. Barth, p.263.
139. J.D.Smart, The Interpretation of Scripture, Philadelphia 1961 p.133.
140. E.Käsemann, Jesus means Freedom, London, 1969 pp99 and 112.
141. G.Bornkamm op.cit p.238 actually uses the metaphor when writing on Ephesians and probably derives the analogy from our passage. He writes "Paul is absolutely misunderstood when he is reproached, as he often is, with having by means of his theology forced his way between Jesus and Christianity and by reason of his "complicated" doctrine of salvation having erected a new barrier between God and Man. The author of Ephesians had a much truer estimate of what the Pauline Gospel was trying to do. It aimed at nothing less than the proclamation that Christ has broken down the dividing wall of hostility" (between God and man and also between Jew and Gentile). David M.Paton, ed, Breaking Barriers, London and Grand Rapids, 1976, (Official Report of the 1975 WCC Assembly, Nairobi) and The New English Bible, section Acts 13:1 - 15:35, entitled The Church breaks barriers, probably have Ephesians 2:14 in mind.
142. L.Cappellus (1585 - 1658) Critici Sacri, Frankfurt on Main, 1965.5 pp590 - 1, while understanding the temple barrier (or the veil) "acknowledges that other commentators believe the metaphor is taken from the/

from the dividing wall, which customarily separates and distinguishes connected houses and keeps apart the families living in them, cited W.Rader, p.104.

143. See F.Lyall, "Legal Metaphors in the Epistles", TB 32 (1981) 81 - 95, V.Heylin, "Les métaphores et les metonymies dans les épîtres pauliniennes", ETL 8 (1935) pp253 - 90, has emphasised those in Ephesians. G.S.Hendry "Biblical Metaphors and Theological Construction", Princeton Seminary Bulletin, n.s.2 (1979) asks how do we know that a particular locution is a metaphor?
144. Philo, Quest in Gen, 3:27 (on Gen 16:7).
145. E.J.Goodspeed, The Key to Ephesians, p.vii thinks it is a temple reference, but after AD70. The reference is more natural after the temple had been destroyed than before that tragic denouement. Realistically the wrecking of the temple had eliminated that monumental barrier.
K.M.Fischer p.135 and Sahlin, op.cit pp13, 17 think it is a wall in the temple.
146. Ellicott. Candlish sees only an allusion. Harless interpreted the wall as between God and man rather than between Jew and Gentile.
147. Gore says Paul was a prisoner in Rome because of the Trophimus incident.
J.Klausner, From Jesus to Paul, London, 1944, p.400 goes so far as to say that Paul might have brought Asians into the temple. Bruce, Paul p.351, understandably, calls this astonishing.
148. Josephus, Ant.20:219. See J.Jeremias, Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus, London, 1969 p.22. Details of the temple are given in the Tractate M. Middoth.
149. Josephus. B.J. 5.36.
150. E.J.Bickermann, "The Warning Inscription of Herod's Temple", JQR 37 (1946 - 7) 387 - 405. See 38 (1947 - 8) pp111- 16 and cf F.J.Hollis, The Archaeology of Herod's Temple, 1934 E.Schürer, op.cit 1973 ed. p.309 and L.M.Vincent, "Le Temple hérodien d'après la Misnah", RB 61 (1954) pp5 - 35, 398 - 418. Page 15 has a chart of the temple.
D.M.Jacobson, "Ideas concerning the plan of Herod's Temple", PEQ 112 (1980) 32 - 40, shows that the precise location of the temple is uncertain, e.g. of the base of the altar or of the Holy of Holies.
151. A.Deissmann, Light from the Ancient East, London 1911, pp74ff cf T.R.Glover, Paul of Tarsus, London, 1938, p.167. Philo, Leg ad Caium, 31.
152. A.Edersheim/

152. A.Edersheim, The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah, London, 1900 vol.1, p.244 and The Temple, London 1959, p.45.
153. b.Shebiioth 14a says one could not enter the temple court if unclean.
154. Cf.Plutarch, De Isid 4 (152d). F.V.Filson, op.cit p.41 points out that Herod deliberately enlarged the area of the outer court to allow Gentiles to enter, possibly to spread his architectural fame and also the Israelite dream of the temple being a place for Gentile worship. Cf.Mk 11:17.
155. E.J.Bickermann op.cit pp389f refers to Excavations at Dura-Europos vii, Report, 186, M.R.Savignac and G.Hosfield, "A Nabataean Shrine of the Temple of Ramm", RB 42 (1935) p.249 and G.V.Stevens, The Periclean Entrance Court of the Acropolis of Athens, 1936, p.67. He cites C.H.Kraeling, Gerasa (1938) p.131.
156. Bickermann op.cit p.390 citing F.Cumont in Real-Encycl. der class Altertumswiss viii 893 κατὰ κέλυσιν θεοῦ μεγίστου καὶ ἁγίου ὕ(=οί) ὀρνυόντες ἐν τεύχεσιν. The text is explained differently by Ch.Clermont - Garneau, Recueil d'archaeol orient 5.350.
157. OG15 598 (Orientis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae ed.W.Dittenberger, 1903 - 5). See also J.H.Illiffe, "The Thanatos Inscription from Herod's Temple, Fragments of a 2nd Copy", Qrtly of Dept of Antiquities in Palestine, 6 (1938) 1ff. Cf. Ch.Clermont - Garneau "Discovery of a Tablet from Herod's Temple", PEFQS 2 (1871) p.132 - 133.
158. ibid, "Une Stèle du Temple de Jerusalem", Revue Archéologique xxiii (1872) Part 1.214ff, Part 2.290ff. There is a photograph between 290 and 291 and a plan of the area in Jerusalem where it was discovered on p.296. See R.P.L.H.Vincent, "Chronique - Découverte de la "Synagogue des Affranchis" à Jerusalem", RB 20 (1921) 247 - 77 who calls it a brilliant discovery (p.263). See plate iv (between pp248 and 249). G.E.Wright, Biblical Archaeology Philadelphia 1957 p.225 has a picture of the inscription.
159. Josephus, Amt, 17:6:3.
160. So M.J.Derenbourg, "Une Stèle du Temple d'Herode", Journal Asiatique 20 (1872) p.185 as Lev 10:2, Num 1:51, Lev 22:9. Cf Xenophon, Anab 5.313.
161. Cf. Aristophanes Ranae 628, ἀγορεύω τινὶ ἐπεὶ μή βασιανίσειν ἑαυτὸν οὐτρεὶ δέμη αὐτὸς σεαυτὸν αἰτιῶ cited Bickermann op.cit p.395.
162. Ibid p.400.
163. Details /

163. Details are found in J.Jeremias, op.cit p.209. Philo, De Spec Leg. 1:156 describes their functions in great detail. They were stationed at different places, including by the Chel to prevent intentional or unintentional offenders.
164. For details see C.K.Barrett, John, London, 1978, pp.533ff. E.Schürer op.cit (1979) 2.221.
165. See D.R.Catchpole, "The Problem of the Historicity of the Sanhedrin Trial" in The Trial of Jesus, ed, E.Bammel, London, 1970 pp 47 - 65 esp pp58ff. F.F.Bruce, The Acts, London, 1952, p.179 and L.Morris, Luke, London, 1974, p.319.
166. e.g. Stephen. C.S.C.Williams, Acts, London, 1957 pp111f thinks it possible that parts of the account of Stephen's death have been assimilated to the story of the passion of Jesus. Cf later Martyrologies e.g. Martyrium Polycarpi.
167. In addition to Stephen see Acts 14:19 and 2.Cor 11:25 (inflicted by Jews outside of Palestine) and James (Eus H.E.2:23).
168. C.K.Barrett, op.cit p.535.
169. Y.Sanhedrin, 1:18a, 34, 7:24b, 41 (cited by Barrett pp533f) says the right was taken away 40 years before AD 70. This is a mistaken deduction from Abodah Zarah 8b that says the Sanhedrin migrated from the temple then, There could therefore be no capital sentences, which could only be passed in the temple.
170. R.A.Stewart, "Judicial Procedure in New Testament Times", EQ 47 (1975) 94 - 109 p.101.
171. Cf Dibelius p.69. 2 Esdras and 2 Baruch show that the loss of the temple produced a profound sense of mourning, joined to a yearning for restoration. See the evidence for the continuation of the temple rites after AD 70 assembled by K.W.Clark and cited by R.M.Grant, A Historical Introduction to the New Testament, London and Glasgow, 1971 p.431. K.W.Clark, "Worship in the Jerusalem Temple after AD 70", in The Gentile Bias and other essays, pp9 - 20, esp 14. See Josephus A.J. 3.224 - 236, Didache 13 and 14, Ep Barnabas 16. E.Scott, The Epistles of Paul to the Colossians, to Philemon and to the Ephesians, London, 1930, p.171 thinks they would know of the temple.
172. Abott believes this is possible.
173. Barth p.12 "Not impossible that a post-Pauline author characterized by a cruel and malicious heart might ascribe the greatest blessing to that dreadful catastrophe" but S.G.F.Brandon, The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church, London, 1965 7 p.216 explicitly states that the author/

the author of Ephesians "is able to refrain from any exaltation over the fall of Israel".

174. Brandon, "Jerusalem AD 70" *History Today* 20 (1970) 814 - 186 (815) cites E.Meyer, Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums 1921 - 3, that nascent Christianity was wholly unaffected by the Jewish catastrophe and that it had merely viewed the event detachedly as divine punishment merited by a stiff-necked people, who had rejected their Messiah. Brandon claims that it was essentially a Gentile saviour god religion that emerged from the obliteration in AD 70 of the original Jewish form of the faith founded by Jesus. Yet he claims in the work cited in note 173 that it led to a rehabilitation of Paul and the appearance of further New Testament writings generally expressing the Pauline viewpoint. Jerusalem Christians fled to Alexandria (not Pella) and produced Matthew, James and Hebrews. Gnailka thinks it was not a visible symbol for the author since the temple "bereits in Trümmern lag".
See J. Neusner in J.H. Hayes and J.M. Miller, Israelite and Judaeon History, London, 1978 pp667ff for 4 responses to the destruction of the temple and cult. a. The apocalypticist looked to the future. b. Qumran and c. Christianity met the issue long before by replacing the temple with a new community. d. The Pharisees were in between, stressing that each Jew must act as a temple priest.
175. Compare J. Moffatt's arguments for Hebrews being addressed to Gentiles and not Jews. These Gentiles would know about the tabernacle from their study of the Old Testament after they became Christians.
Hebrews, Edinburgh, 1924, p.xvi.
176. Ezekiel 44:9 - 16 only allows the people of Israel to share in its rites.
177. Isaiah 28:16 is probably an allusion to the huge and costly foundation stones of the temple, 1.Kings 5:17.
178. The idea of the temple, no longer restricted by walls, is well known. 4Q Flor, has strict conditions for entrance into the new pure spiritual temple. "That is the house where there shall not enter (anyone whose flesh has a permanent) (blemish) or an Ammonite or a Moabite or a bastard or an alien or a stranger for ever". See B.Gärtner, The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament Cambridge, 1965 pp60 - 66. Ezek 44:9 has restrictions for foreigners, but in Rev 21:25, there is no temple except the lamb and although the city has walls, the gates are never shut. Zech 2:4 had depicted Jerusalem as being without walls. Eph 2:21 seems to use Zech 6:15 "those/

"those who are afar off shall come and help to build the temple of the Lord". Cf Gärtner *ibid* pp30 - 42.

179. Note the other barriers in the temple. Although the writer refers expressly to the wall which divides Gentiles and Jews, it is possible as Lamadrid suggests (1:230) that in the present case, he was thinking of other barriers among people, which are reflected in the temple area between men and women, laity and priests and between social classes. Philo, De Spec Leg 1:67ff says that since God is one, there should be one temple. He commends Jews who come from far to the temple and goes on to mention the larger outer wall (ἐξώτατὴν περίβολος), and the smaller inner walls.
- M.Haran, Temples and Temple Service in Ancient Israel, Oxford 1978 shows how the Levites were permitted to come near the sacred furniture to dismantle it but the ordinary Israelite could not do so. (Num 8:19, 16:9 - 10, 18:22 - 23). The Levites had this privilege, only when the furniture was covered. (p.181) Their other duties included seeing that no stranger approached the tabernacle (p.182). During encampment not even the Levites could come near and an outsider who did was put to death (Num 1:51, 3:10, 38, 18:7).
180. Olshausen p.181.
181. E.J.Goodspeed, *op.cit* vii, uses the barrier to date Ephesians as later than Paul. Cf Pokorný, Epheserbrief und die Gnosis, Berlin, 1965, p.13.
182. So M.H.Scharlemann, "The Secret of God's Plan. Studies in Ephesians 4" *Conc Th. Monthly* 41 (1970) 410 - 420 esp 414 and F.Mussner *op.cit*.
183. Cf 1:1 and 3:18 and CD 4:19, 8:12, 18. The phrase "builders of the wall" is probably a description of the rabbinical interpreters of the law in contrast to the false prophets of Ezek 13:10, who break down the wall.
184. See R.H.Charles, *op.cit* 2, pp10, 18, 19. G.F.Moore *op.cit* 1, pp258-62.
185. O.Betz, "The Eschatological Interpretation of the Sinai Tradition in Qumran and in the New Testament", *RQ* 6 (1967 - 9) 89 - 107.
186. Philo (*Quest in Gen* 3:27 (on Gen 16:7) uses the word wall in a protective sense. He says the 5th symbol or type in the Hagar story is "on the road" that is to Shur. This road is a wall and a protection to those able to save themselves (not a trackless route).
187. O.Betz *op.cit* p.105.
188. Walls and barriers are referred to in discussion of the Passover. b. Pesachim 85b thinks a person outside the doorstep is not counted with those in the house for the Passover, although R.Joshua b Levi said he could/

could be counted. "Even an iron partition cannot interpose between Israel and their father in heaven". 86b mentions a dispute as to whether one could eat the passover in two rooms. R.Ashi suggests to R.Kahana that you should rather ask it as a question. "Does the removing of a partition or the setting up of one transform it into two places or two companies (respectively) or not?" b. Berak 63A has a metaphorical use of fence.

189. Mark 15:38. This incident can claim historical support. See A.Edersheim, Life and Times, 2:610ff citing Josephus BJ 6.5.3 and Talmud Jer Yoma 43c, 39b.
Alford thinks it is the primary allusion. L.Cappellus, Critici Sacri, Frankfurt A.Main 1695, 5, pp590-1 sees an allusion to both the temple barrier and the veil. See A.Gill, "Note upon Eph 2:14" Exp.T 2 (1890 - 1) 93 and C.Gore.
190. There is a description and a plan of the temple in G.W.Buchanan, Hebrews, New York, 1976, p.140 - 42. See note 150.
191. Cited Elaine W.Pagels, The Gnostic Paul. Gnostic Exegesis of the Pauline Letters, Philadelphia 1975, pp119, 20 from Origen's commentary on John 13:25. Theodotus indicates that Christ has done away with the Temple Barrier. (Clement Exc ex Theod 38:2-3).
192. Abbott.
193. So F.Rienecker, p.97. Also Ewald.
194. So Haupt (approving of Meyer's view "begreift die ganze religiöse Eigenart, namentlich das Bundverhältnis zu Gott", and J.Knabenbauer (cited Lamadrid 1:228).
195. Beck compares these passages. Cf Candlish and Monod.
196. The particularist prophet is made to look ridiculous, more concerned for the gourd than he is for the Ninevites.
There is also defilement of contact. Jewish ceremonial laws meant that Jews had to keep away from Gentiles, thus creating a barrier. (This separation is seen in John 18:28, Acts 16:20 and 18:2).
This thought, if found in Eph 2:14 would link with the ordinances, cf 2:15.
The barricades of the Ghetto are a possibility (Ewald) although unlikely, since there is no evidence of the terms being used in this way. Meyer thinks that such a reference is too wide. Gronovius saw partitions in a large city inhabited by people of different nations. (cited by Eadie.)
197. O.Betz op.cit pp94ff shows that the Qumran emphasis on exclusiveness comes/

comes from the struggle for the preservation of a consecrated people in the Sinai tradition of the Old Testament. Ex 19:23, bounds around the mountain, 19:12, bounds around the people.

198. J.Gnilka appreciates this distinction between the law and the metaphor which the author uses to show its divisive aspect. Lamadrid 1:228 sees the two aspects. He says the major difficulty is to know precisely what is real and what is secondary behind the expression. H.F.Weiss, Untersuchungen zur Kosmologie des hellenistischen und palästinischen Judentums, TU 97, Berlin, 1966 pp277ff, having studied Philo's understanding of the law, thinks it impossible in our text to accept a precise identification of wall and hedge with law.
199. So Masson and Stoeckhardt.
200. The barrier could be sin, which according to Is 59:2 (the same section of Isaiah as 57:19) is what separated men from God. This would be the result of breaking the law and of the weakness of the flesh. Ps 106:23 has Moses standing in the breach as Mediator (cf Ex 32:11). But this passage is the opposite of seeing Israel as a privileged people. They are in grave danger of being destroyed. Another possibility is the flesh. Victorinus, Chrysostom and Ambrosiaster (cited Barth p.285) identified the wall with the flesh or simply with enmity against God. Ephesians 2:11 mentions the flesh twice, first of Jews, and then of Gentiles. Gal 5:19 - 21 speaks of enmity as one of the works of the flesh. Eph 2:14 links law, wall and enmity by saying Jesus has removed them in his flesh. Hebrews 10:20 links flesh with the barrier of the veil. (As in Eph 2:15, flesh is not used in the normal Pauline sense of creaturely weakness subject to sin, cf Rom 8:3). Eph 2:15 could be a reference to Jesus removing the barrier caused by the circumcision in the flesh. But the reference to flesh is unlikely to be the antecedent, since v.11 is four verses earlier.
201. 1.Enoch 14:9 "And I went in till I drew nigh to a wall, which is built of crystals and surrounded by tongues of fire." (i.e. Enoch is carried up to heaven and passes within the outer court of God's palace.) Baruch 2:1, Syr Baruch 54:9 "Thou breakest up the enclosure of those who are ignorant".
202. He cites CD 6:7ff. "The wall is built, the boundary far removed". (Micah 7:11) This means there are new members added to the house of Jacob, but when the age is completed, no more will be added. IQH 1:3 "And you have made around me a wall" IQH 2 (Thou Lord) "hast hedged/

hedged me about against all snares of the pit". Cf CD 6. They shall bar the door, forasmuch as God said, "who among you will bar its door?" CD8 "Those who have breached the bound will be cut off".

203. Gal 4:3 may be a reference to the pagan background of the Galatians. But if Gal 4:3 precedes Eph and if Eph is Paul's, or from a Pauline school, Gal 4:3 might lie behind Eph 2:15 and there be a development in Paul's understanding of the law. Cf H.Hübner, Das Gesetz bei Paulus, Göttingen, 1978 p.32 and E.Lohse, op.cit 97ff. H.Schlier, Galater, Göttingen, 1965 pp190ff.
204. J.McPherson, Commentary on Ephesians, Edinburgh, 1892, cited as Macpherson and ad loc.
205. See F.J.Foakes-Jackson and K.Lake, The Beginnings of Christianity, London, vols 4 and 5 (1933). Homer Iliad 21:470f calls her *νότια θῆρῶν Ἀρτεμῖς ἑρπορέη* mistress of wild beasts, mother of the wilds.
206. See Strabo, Geography, 14:1:22 and Plutarch, Life of Alexander, 3:3, WH Smith, A History of Greece, London 1902, p.148. The temple erected circa 350 B.C. was one of the seven wonders of the Ancient World. It was burned by the Goths in A.D.262.
207. See Pliny, Natural History, 36:95 - 7.
208. See B.Fletcher, A History of Architecture on the Comparative Method. 1896, 17th edition rev. by R.A.Cordingley, London, 1961. J.T.Wood, Discoveries at Ephesus, London, 1877. D.G.Hogarth, Excavations at Ephesus, 2 vols, London, 1908. W.R.Lethaby, "The Earlier Temple of Artemis at Ephesus", Journal of Hellenic Studies, 37 (1917) 1 - 16. W.Smith, op.cit p.159 shows that at Pergamum, the Great Altar of Zeus was on a platform 98 by 90 by 20 feet high. The sacred enclosures within which the principal Greek temples were erected, were entered by great porches known as propylaea. The best known was at Athens. At the further end, the porticus was enclosed by a wall with 3 doorways. A good description of the Ephesian temple is found in Beet pp21f who depicts the central shrine of Cella containing the famous image of the goddess with a vestibule in front and a large chamber behind.
209. G.C.Martin, p.15. Bengel = "He writes with great propriety to the Ephesians too, regarding the union of Jews and Gentiles, for the temple at Jerusalem had been the stronghold of Judaism." Cf G.S.Duncan, St.Paul's Ephesian Ministry, London, 1929, pp120, 1.
210. See note/

210. See note 208.
211. Bickermann op.cit p.397 refers to a slab from the third century B.C. preserving a law of sanction from Cyme (Asia Minor) which says, "whoever wishes may kill the offender. The killer will be considered as ceremoniously clean and guiltless", *κτείνεται δὲ αὐτὸν ὁ θέλων ὃ δὲ ἀποκτείνει εὐάγης ἔστω καὶ καθαρός*.
212. See J.J.Coulton, Greek Architects at Work, London, 1977, it is true that Greek religion had changed. In the seventh century, the temple was the centre for popular worship, but by the first century A.D., it was the centre of civil religion. The Mysteries provided the truly religious element.
213. The Dorians were excluded from a sanctuary at Paros for political reasons. Bickermann, op.cit p.391, finds only one instance where people were banned for purely ethnic reasons. This is cited in Ch.Picard, Comptes Rendus Acad der Inscript, 1944 p.91.
214. Bickermann ibid. See A.D.Nock, "A vision of Mandulis Aion", HTR 27 (1934) 53 - 104, esp p.58.
215. Bickermann ibid cites P.Roussel, Bull. Corr. Hell, (1927) 131.
216. Strabo 15.1.73 (719, 20).
217. Isocrates, Panegyricus 157. E.Lohse, op.cit 234, says barbarians (those who had not mastered Greek) and murderers were not initiated at Eleusis.
218. Bickermann op.cit p.393. In Egypt from the time of the Ptolemies, the ritual was administered to priests and their offspring only. Phil, De Spec Leg.1:1-16 uses this fact to prove that Israel as a whole was a priestly people.
219. F.F.Bruce, The Spreading Flame, Exeter, 1958, pp246ff.
220. F.C.Baur, Paulus der Apostel Jesus Christi, Stuttgart, 1845 p.436.
221. D.Smith op.cit p.35. Smith challenges this unified background.
222. E.Kasemann, Leib und Leib Christi, Tübingen, 1933, He finds his main support in The Acts of Thomas (p.67).
223. Schlier, CK p.19.
224. Cited in Section 4424.
225. Manda means gnosis. The sect still survives in Iraq and claims its founder was John the Baptist. It probably arose on the periphery of Judaism, cir 100 AD and migrated to Mesopotamia, mingling gnostic thought and Syriac Christianity's views on baptism. Under Islam, their writings had to be authoritative for the sect to survive. They also needed to claim a historical founder like the Baptist. See E.Lohse, op.cit/

op.cit p.270.

226. Schlief CK uses Lidzbarski's translation, but a recent LT of most of the passages, referred to by Schlief, is given in Foerster.
227. C.H.Dodd, The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, Cambridge, 1953 p.115.
228. Schlief CK p.20 in Lidzbarski's translation. It was translated completely by Lady E.S.Drower in 1959.
229. A.Lindemann p.162.
230. Details in Lindemann p.163 and A.Adam, Die Psalmen des Thomas und das Perlenlied als Zeugnisse vorchristlicher Gnosis, Berlin 1959.
231. Gnika p.140, se CH 1:14 Sanders p.92 thinks P.Pokorný is hardly correct to say (ZNW 183f) that CH 1:24 - 6 refers to the "annihilation" of the wall blocking the way to heaven. The discussion is rather of passing through the various spheres. The other parallels which Pokorný cites are not uniformly relevant. CH4:6 has "both" and "the two", but no reference to destruction of a wall blocking the way to heaven (although found in 1:14). Other examples which Pokorný cites are from the Naassene Preaching which does refer to Eph 5:14 as Scripture. (Hippolytus. Ref. 5.7.33, mentioning the cornerstone (5:3.35)).
232. See the discussion on whether the Odes are really gnostic (ch.3.n. 51 of this thesis).
233. Sanders, p.90.
234. In the OT., the verb נָתַן is found in Hos 2:8, Amos 9:11 and about 11 times in all. The noun נָתַן cir 23 times, including Is 5:5 and the feminine noun $\text{נִתְּנָה$ about 17 times. Schille p.27 finds reference to a Cosmic wall in IQH 3:26ff and 8:27f, but it is not very clear (see Gnika p.140).
235. E.Best op.cit p.152n, speaking of the references available when he wrote, says "those which may have escaped such influence have little real bearing on the question". Likewise Schlief cannot be said to have made his point on the more general issue, that behind vv 14 - 16 there lies the myth of the Heavenly Man". M.Klemm op.cit p.35f, shares Schlief's viewpoint, but cites no other author apart from Schlief.
236. E.Kasemann, op.cit pp139 - 141.
237. Schlief in His Commentary in contrast with CK.
238. N.A.Dahl, Das Volk Gottes, Oslo 1941 p.260 says that Schlief's statement "in concepts and language Ephesians is a product of the Hellenistic-/"

Hellenistic - Oriental (Syriac) environment" should be modified to read "that this environment presents above all a Hellenistic Oriental (Gnostic) Judaism".

E.Schweizer, Neotestamentica, p.304 shows, the thought of reconciliation of both spheres, heavenly and earthly in gnosticism, is unthinkable. Sanders, p.90 believes that a gnostic Jewish original hymn would have the words "to God" which Schlier removes on hymnic grounds.

239. Schlier CK p.74.
240. E.Kasemann, op.cit pp156 - 8.
241. See Kasemann's review of Percy, Probleme, in Gnomon, 21 (1949) 342-7.
242. Ignatius probably knew Ephesians. See R.Grant, The Formation of the New Testament, New York, 1965, p.95, who thinks Ignatius derives some of his experiences about the unity of the church from Ephesians.
H.Rathke, Ignatius von Antiochen und die Paulusbriefe, TU 99 Berlin, 1967, p.65 agrees. But H.Schlier, Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu den Ignatiusbriefen, Giessen, 1929, p.177 and V.Corwin, St. Ignatius and Christianity in Antioch, New Haven, 1960 p.67 conclude that he did not know Ephesians. (Cited Rader pp5, 6.)
243. So Bruce, Paul, p.437.
244. Origen, Commentary on John 10:33.
245. E.Pagels op.cit pp120f shows that since the gnostics claimed Paul as their source of teaching and found in his writings two levels of meaning, psychic and spiritual, they considered the Jewish-Gentile question a dated issue and allegorically reinterpreted as two groups of people psychics and spirituals. Cf Theod. Exc. 38:2 - 3. "Christ has come down to break down the partition that separates the psychic from the pneumatic region." and the Gospel of Truth 34:1 - 36.
"Faith came, destroyed the separation and brought the warm fulness of love". Heracleon (Origen's commentary on John 10:33) thinks the cross symbolises the power of the spirit to separate what is hyllic and to purify what is pneumatic.
246. Rader p.9n.
247. H.Chadwick, The Early Church, London, 1967.
248. R.Reitzenstein, Poimandres, Leipzig, 1904, p.248, tried to prove the pre-Christian origin of the gnostic myth of the Primal man by using
 1. The Naassene Sermon, 2. The Book of the Alchemist Zosimus,
 3. The Neoplatonist Jamblichus (4th century AD) and especially,
 4. The Hermetic Tractate Poimandres. He maintained that the Hermetica/

Hermetica were the culmination of a long development in pre-Christian Egypt and that the doctrine of the Primal Man found there is pre-Christian.

He was jealous of the work of the creator of the world and wanted to engage in creative activity. See Poimandres 1:13 - 15. Cf W.Bousset op.cit p.16. Reitzenstein in his Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen, Leipzig, 1920, argued that Paul was not the first but the greatest of the gnostics. This view has not received support but his basic proposition that Paul's world of thought was conditioned by this pre-Christian gnosticism and the Iranian myth of the redeemed Redeemer is widely held as plausible, despite the complete system not being found before Mani who died just prior to 300 AD.

R.Bultmann op.cit 1 pp167ff regarded gnosticism as coming from the near east and infiltrating Judaism and Hellenistic paganism as well as Christianity.

249. D.Smith op.cit p.47.

W.Bauer, Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity, London 1972. (German 1934) has argued that early Christianity was more diverse than we imagine and what we call orthodoxy did not prevail before the fourth century. Various areas had their distinctive Christianity. The church at Edessa began on what would later have been called a heretical basis. Some of these centres may have had a type of Christianity akin to later gnosticism. However, although there was a penumbra between heresy and orthodoxy, there was always a recognizable core of orthodoxy. This is demonstrated by H.E.W.Turner, The Patterns of Christian Truth, London 1954. I.H.Marshall, Orthodoxy and Heresy in earlier Christianity, Themelios, 2 (1976 - 7) 5 - 14 and J.D.G.Dunn op.cit.

250. See note 242.

A pre-Christian origin of Mandaeism was proposed by Lidzbarski, Reitzenstein, Bultmann, and E.S.Drower, The Mandaeans of Iraq and Iran, their cults, customs, magic legends and folklore, Oxford, 1937. This would mean that the Mandaeans had a very long oral tradition and when it was finally written gave no clues of its ancient origin. It would mean that it was a sect that for hundreds of years was able to live in anonymity with no persecution by anybody; an almost miraculous achievement. E.Peterson, "Urchristentum und Mandäismus" ZNW 27 (1928) 55 - 98, esp 62f dated Mandaean literature and their residence in Maysan from the 8th century AD. F.C.Burkitt, Church and Gnosis, Cambridge/

Cambridge, 1932 pp92 - 123 shows that they possessed the Syriac Peshitta.

251. C.Colpe, Die religionsgeschichte Schule, Göttingen, 1961, p.140ff; 174 and 191 and M.Schenke, Der Gott-Mensch in der Gnosis, Göttingen 1962 p.19. E.Yamauchi, "Pre-Christian Gnosticism in the Nag Hammadi Texts" Church History 48 (1979) 120 - 41, says the vast majority of the 52 tractates are Christian Gnostic from the second and third centuries and that the case for pre-Christian Gnosticism can only be argued for a few, e.g. The Apocalypse of Adam and the Paraphrase of Shem.
252. See C.K.Barrett, Pauline Controversies in the Post-Pauline Period, NTS 20 (1973 - 4) 229 - 45.
253. D.Smith op.cit p.47 tries to broaden the background of thought which Ephesians uses, collecting, interpreting and weaving together materials from various traditional backgrounds.
Barth, p.286, thinks none of the explanations of the wall, such as temple, veil, law, sin, cosmic barrier "is so persuasive as to completely rule out the alternatives".
254. Clement, Strom. 6:106.3-107.3 reads "The covenant of salvation reaching down to us from the foundation of the world is one. Therefore one unchangeable gift of salvation given by one God through one Lord is befitting in many ways. For which cause the middle wall (μεσότης) which separated the Greek from the Jew is taken away in order that there might be a peculiar people . . . till they grow into a perfect man."
255. e.g. Tertullian, Adv.Marc. 5:17, uses of Jew and Gentile.
256. Hippolytus, In Danielelem, expounding 4:31.
257. Chrysostom, Hom. Eph 5 and 6. Hom Mt 3:3. Cf Jerome, Letters, 123
At the birth of Pharez and Zarah was broken down that middle wall of partition which typified the division existing between two people.
258. Ambrose, Expositio evangelii secundum Lucam (on Lk 3:26) he was supported by Gregory of Nyssa. (See Rader op.cit pp41, 42)
259. Aquinas, Commentary on Ephesians in Super epistolas S. Pauli lectura. ed. P.R.Cai, Rome 1953, II pp27 - 33 (cited Rader p.60). The world is like a field full of men divided by a wall, which is the law.
260. Abbott shows it is a suitable word because of its use in John 2:19 and having ἔκδοσις as object in classical writers.
261. O.Betz, op.cit p.105.
262. Gill, op.cit p.93 suggests that the object in breaking is to effect a union/

a union wider and greater than could possibly take place under the old condition.

- 263. F.F.Bruce, Paul and Jesus, Grand Rapids, 1974, p.36.
- 264. G.H.Whitaker, Ephesians explained, London 1892, p.45

NOTES FOR CHAPTER FIVE

1. Haupt pp78ff omits enmity as a gloss. Gnilka thinks that Schille is wrong to omit, since enmity refers to what precedes it in the text.
2. H.Bietenhard, "Enemy, enmity, hate" NIDNTT 1.553ff cites Ex 23:22, Jos 7:8 and 2.Sam 12:14.
3. The word has a passive meaning in Homer, Iliad. 9.312, Od.12:452 and 14:156. But in Hesiod we find the active element of an opponent (op 340, cf Thucydides 8.45). See H.H.Liddell and R.Scott, A Greek-English Lexicon, Oxford, 1968 and TDNT 1.553ff. The other word $\mu\iota\sigma\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ meant originally the resentment which arises when someone feels himself injured by the behaviour of another. The active element is supplied by $\acute{\epsilon}\chi\theta\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$.
4. Ewald thinks it is possible that $\acute{\epsilon}\chi\theta\rho\alpha\nu$ is linked with $\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\alpha\varsigma$ although $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \tau\eta\ \sigma\alpha\rho\kappa\iota$ is then isolated, but if $\tau\eta\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\chi\theta\rho\alpha\nu$ is linked with $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\rho\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\omega$, $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \tau\eta\ \sigma\alpha\rho\kappa\iota$ can be connected, "annulling the enmity in his flesh, the law of commandments in decrees". This has the advantage of not explicitly stating that the law is an enmity.
A most unlikely possibility which need only be considered if the other two prove impossible is to make $\acute{\epsilon}\chi\theta\rho\alpha\nu$ depend on the even earlier and more distant $\pi\omicron\iota\gamma\acute{\iota}\sigma\alpha\varsigma$ and parallel to "both one". It is difficult to make sense of such a statement as "making enmity in his flesh".
5. There is little evidence that Paul thought in this way. The nearest is Rom 1:3, Gal 4:4. Paul was more concerned with the divine Lord, although he was not indifferent to the historical Jesus. See H.R.Mackintosh, The Person of Christ, Edinburgh 1913, p.62.
6. See Abbott's criticism of understanding "flesh" as humanity (Chrysostom) or as the Jews.
7. There is a discussion in A.T.Hanson, The wrath of the Lamb, London 1957, pp105ff.
8. Some older scholars felt reconciliation must be included. Olshausen lists Chrysostom, Theophylact, Oecumenius and Harless. Others include Burton and P.Feine, "Eph 2:14 - 16" TSK (1899) 540 - 74. Olshausen believes it is only human relationships, as enmity to God would not be used of the law. Harless thinks it is because v.16 would not suddenly insert the thought of reconciliation to God. Alford regards the verb $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\omega$ as too strong for human relationships/

- relationships. Photius, Cocceius and Ellicott find it easier to say it is both kinds of reconciliation (see Eadie). P. Stuhlmacher, op.cit p.351 says enmity is used in two sense in 14 and 16. (a) Rebellion of sinners and sin against God (Rom 5:8ff S.B. 3.591f) and (b) Rebellion between two groups of humanity (3 Macc 3:4, S.B. 3, 139ff + 144ff).
9. Schille p.28 believed the original hymn referred to reconciliation between God and the world. It would have in mind the principalities and powers of the cosmic world (3:10, 6:12, 16), cf the Mandaeans who taught mutual hostility between the world of light (ahura) and darkness (hsuka). If the wall in Eph 2:14 were cosmic, the hostility is that of the cosmic powers, which prevented the imprisoned souls from being released. Those that were released were hindered in their progress to the upperworld. If that were in mind in the metaphor, it is between God and man. According to Schlier, the enmity in Ephesians is seen in terms of the Ascension of Isaiah 11 where the visionary sees a battle in heaven which has its counterpart on earth (p.138). See R.Yates "The Powers of Evil in the New Testament" EQ 59 (1980) 97 - 111.
 10. G.Dix, Jew and Greek. A Study in the Primitive Church, Westminster, 1953, p.60 argues that the conflict of Syriac and Greek cultures played an important role in world history for several millennia. Hostility has ceased in the churches which Paul knows. Abbott thinks enmity is obviously that between Jews and Gentiles. This naturally loomed much larger in the apostles mind than it did with Chrysostom and ourselves.
 11. So Eadie. Gnika's "Die Gesetzesmauer bedeutete Feindschaft" is too strong. It was not the law's intention to be such. We cannot therefore accept the interpretation of Theodoret, Calvin, Bucer, Clarius, Grotius, Calovius, Morus, Rosenmüller, Flatt, Meier, Holzhausen, Olshausen and Conybeare that $\epsilon\chi\theta\rho\alpha$ is the ceremonial law as the ground of the enmity between Jew and Gentile. Like Erasmus, Vatablus, Estius, Rückert and Meyer (listed and supported by Eadie) we contrast with $\epsilon\iota\rho\acute{\eta}\nu\eta$ the actual existing enmity of Israel and non-Israel, an enmity of which the ceremonial law was the virtual, but innocent occasion. (Est 3:8; Acts 11:3, 22; 1.Th 2:15.)
 12. MacPherson.
 13. G.Wilson, op.cit ad loc "To the Jews the law was the bastion of their privileges from which they looked down on Gentiles with unmingled contempt, while to Gentiles it was the outlandish rampart of an assumed superiority/

superiority, behind which the enemies of the human race practised their abominable rites."

14. Sifre Zuta Numbers 18 "Whoever hateth any man, hateth him who spoke and the world came into existence - any man that is, whether Jew or non-Jew." See I, Epstein, op.cit p.148.
15. Juvenal, Satires, 14:96 - 106. Cf Julius Caesar who, according to Scharlemann op.cit p.414, exempted Jews from military service because they would not work on the Sabbath and eat normal rations provided for Roman troops. See Cambridge Ancient History, vol.9, 1932, p.430. Josephus C.Apion, 2.121ff refutes Apion for saying that the Jews swore by the God of heaven and earth never to show goodwill to a man of another nation and especially never to the Greeks. "We neither hate nor envy them". (2.123). See E.Schürer op.cit (1979ed) pp81-84.
16. I.Epstein op.cit p.30, shows the paradox between separation from all contaminating contents and Israel's priestly mission to the world. Ben Sirach says little about the Gentiles. 36:1 - 17 calls upon God to hasten the day when he will destroy the Gentile nations, gather again all the tribes of Jacob and establish the Israelite theocracy throughout the earth.
4.Ezra 9:13 - 22 says "perish then the multitude . . but let my people be preserved." Cf 6:56 E.P.Sanders, op.cit p.361 shows that in 1.Enoch the righteous are always the loyal and obedient. Their opponents are either Gentiles hostile to them or apostate Jews or both. Jubilees, 35:14 indicates that union with Gentiles leads to forsaking the God of Abraham. In 22:20ff the Gentiles are condemned, there is to be no intermarriage with them (30:7 - 14).
17. Obadiah's words are so scathing that K.L.Kuntz op.cit p.422 is tempted to question the wisdom of those who included the work in the canon.
18. W.D.Davies, p.59.
19. F.Millar, "The Background to the Maccabean Revolution, Reflections on Martin Hengel's Judaism and Hellenism," JJS 29 (1978) pp1 - 21 questions M.Hengel's view that the early Hellenistic period saw a significant process of assimilation and comprehension between Judaism and Paganism which ended abruptly with the Maccabean reaction to Antiochus. Millar thinks that Jewish Hellenism was superficial in the 3rd and 2nd centuries before the change of priesthood under the pro-Hellenists Jason and Menelaus.
20. E.P.Sanders, op.cit p.254 shows it is clear in 1QP Hab 5:3-6 that at the time of the eschaton, it is the Gentiles who will be judged and destroyed/

destroyed, while the wicked Israelites will only be punished and perhaps even redeemed. Cf 1QM 1:6, 4:2, 11:11, 14: 5, 11; 1. QS 2:4 - 10, 4:11 - 14, 5:12f.

21. Lamadrid 1:232 asks this question. But Qumran probably preferred Gentiles, who at least had not received the light and then rejected it.
22. See M. Grant, The Jews in the Roman World, Bungay, 1973 pp189ff.
23. See E. Mary Smallwood, The Jews under Roman Rule, Leiden, 1976, p.217n. She translates the prayer Birkath-ha-Minim. " . . . and may the Christians and the heretics suddenly be laid low and not be inscribed with the righteous". See G.F. Moore op.cit p.91 and F.V. Filson, op.cit p.302. S. Sandmel, Anti-Semitism in the New Testament, Philadelphia 1978 146f shows that the 12th Benediction has variants e.g. minim(= Gnostics?) malshinim (= informers, the Romans?) as well as notzrim (Nazarenes? Christians).
24. See N.R.M. De Lange, Origen and the Jews, Cambridge 1976, p.63. 2Esdras 6:56 says "Thou hast said they are nothing and that they are like spittle and thou hast likened the abundance of them to a drop in a bucket".
Paul speaks negatively of Gentiles in Eph 4:17 - 19.
25. In Nezikin b. Baba Kamma 113a, Akiba expounds "whence can we learn that the robbery of a heathen is forbidden?" In b. Baba Bathra 546, Samuel said the property of a heathen is on the same footing as desert land and the first occupier becomes the owner.
M. Sanhedrin, 10:3 says R. Eliezer holds the view that none of the heathen has any share in the world to come. Cf. M. Berakoth 8:6 Pesah 2:7, Nazir 9:1, Gittin 9:8, Bekhoroth 4:1, Negaim 12:1, Tohoroth 7:6.
J.M. Ford, "Zealotism and the Lukan Infancy Narratives", Nov.T. 18 (1976) 280 - 92 says p.282, that the zealots would slay any uncircumcised Gentile who listened to a discourse on God and his laws and then refused to be circumcised. Tanhuma (Duber) 2:116f says the oral law is given to the Jews in order to distinguish them from other nations. An enemy might take their written law, but could not take the oral law.
26. Much of this would be precaution but the suspicion could soon lead to hostility, although unconsciously they had been accepting many Hellenistic ideas. See M. Hengel, Judaism and Hellenism, London, 1974. Compare his Juden, Griechen und Barbaren. Aspekte der Hellenisierung des Judentums/

des Judentums im vorchristlicher Zeit, Stuttgart 1976 and M. Grant op.cit and S. Liebermann, Hellenism in Jewish Palestine, New York 1950. These show that Palestine was not immune to Hellenistic influences. See also the articles in Paganisme, Judaisme, Christianisme, ed. P. Benoit, M. Philonenko and C. Vogel, Paris 1978 (M. Simon, Festschrift) especially F. F. Bruce, "The Romans through Jewish eyes", 1-12 and A. T. Kraabel, "Paganism and Judaism, The Sardis Evidences", 13 - 33.

27. Matthew may reflect such a group. The gospel is sometimes seen as fighting on two fronts, versus Jewish legalism and Christian antinomianism. Cf. G. Bornkamm, "Der Auferstandene und der Irdische (Matt 28:16 - 20) in Zeit und Geschichte (Festschrift for R. Bultmann) Tübingen 1964, pp 171 - 191. See W. Trilling, Das Wahre Israel, Leipzig 1959, p. 190. The aggressive attitude towards the Jews, suggests the church regards herself as the true Israel.

The Nazarenes maintained continuity with Judaism after AD 70, wishing to observe the ordinances which were given by Moses, yet to live with the Christians and the faithful. Cf Justin Dial, 142, where Trypho wishes to keep in contact.

T. Stylianopoulos "N.T. Issues in Jewish Christian Relations", JEcSt. 13 (1976) 586 - 95 discusses the diversified Judaism of the first century of which Christians formed one community. He shows that messianic claims made for Jesus and the identification of the church as the new Israel would soon cause division. This latter aspect however is only implied in the New Testament. (1. Peter 2:9, 10 and Gal 6:16).

Nowhere is it explicitly stated that the church is the new Israel.

28. The Jews' anger would be roused by Christians attempting to get on well with the Roman authorities and blaming the crucifixion upon Jews rather than Pilate (cf Acts 2:23 and 36). Paul received 39 stripes, five times from the Jews, but Romans apologised to him for their mistake. (Acts 16:39).

M. Barth, "Was Paul an Anti-Semite?" J. EcSt 5(1968) 78 - 104 shows that many Jews hold that Jesus represents the best in Judaism, but Paul led the church in the direction of anti-Semitism. He made greater claims for Jesus than Jesus did publicly, which would arouse this hostility.

29. K. S. Latourette, op.cit p. 139, The Martyrdom of Polycarp, 13:1.

30. F. J. Foakes-Jackson, The Rise of Gentile Christianity, London, 1927, p. 191. Few reminiscences of the controversy of the Jews with Christians remain in Tanaaitic literature. See G. F. Moore op.cit p. 92.

31. Cited by/

31. Cited by Lamadrid 1.230 from J.Bonsirven, Le Judaïsme palestinien au temps de Jésus Christ, J.L.Daniel, "Anti-Semitism in the Hellenistic Roman Period," JBL 98 (1979) 44 - 65 gives ample evidence to show anti-Semitism was more severe than is often realised. There was a full fledged pogrom in Alexandria in AD 38.
32. M.Grant op.cit p.25.
33. Diodorus Siculus 31:1:1 and 34:1 - 4. This attitude is well documented in pagan as well as Jewish authors, Quintilian (AD 35 - 96) 3.7.21, Tacitus (55 - 120), Hist 5.4. Posidonius de Apamea, (fl 130 - 50BC) and the much later Philostratus (Vita Apol. Tyan, 5.33). Posidonius explains Antiochus IV's attitude "because it is the only one of the nations which will not have relations of company with other nations and considers them as enemies". Philostratus writes "these people have rebelled not against the Romans but against humanity in general. They are men who produce an unsociable life, who do not share with their fellow-men either the table or the libations or the prayers or the sacrifices, being more distant from us than Susa, Bactria or even India". (Cited Lamadrid 1.230).
The Jews were regarded as eccentric (Horace, Sat 1:9.69 - 70) as physically unattractive (Petronius, Sat 68) as lazy for resting on the Sabbath (Juvenal, Satires 14:96 - 106). Details are found in E.Mary Smallwood, op.cit p.240. Celsus thought it ridiculous to suggest that the Son of God would be sent to the Jews. (Origen, contra Celsum 6:78).
34. Fischer pp87ff.
Mt 20:1 - 16. Cf Fischer p.90 and J.N.Sevenster, The roots of pagan anti-Semitism in the ancient world, Leiden 1975. The roots were only indirectly religious, resting on the separation (amixia) of the Jews on the Sabbath, circumcision and no idolatry.
36. Virtually every major Christian writer of the first five centuries either composed a treatise in opposition to Judaism or made this issue a dominant theme in a treatise devoted to some other subject. See S.Sandmel op.cit pp148ff. J.Pelikan, The Christian Tradition vol, 1, The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition, 100 - 600 AD, Chicago, 1971 p.15. They capitalized on differences between the Hebrew text and the LXX (eg the virgin of Is 7:14). Justin Dial, 71:2, says the Jews had "altogether taken away many Scripture passages from the translations effected by the 70 elders". Cf Acts 13:46, 28:25 - 28. Yet Acts unlike Luke (13:34f, 19:41 - 44, 21:20 - 24, 23:28 - 31) does not have any reference to the divine judgement upon Jerusalem. See I.H.Marshall/

I.H.Marshall, op.cit p.32.

37. Zerwick, p.65. See J.L.Daniel, op.cit esp. Bibliography p.45n.
38. Diodorus Sic 67:14.2. Cf Schürer op.cit (1973) 1p.528.
39. Hippolytus, Ref.7:28.5, 25:3. Irenaeus 1:5.4, 30.6. (Cf Fischer pp92f).
40. The word Jew is used as a metaphor for the lowest class, the Psychics (Irenaeus 1:30.10), Gospel of Philip 6 and 102, Gospel of Thomas 43.
41. Jesus' ministry might be exclusively to the Jews (Mt 10:5 - 6, 15:24, Mk 7:27) but while recognizing that the Gospels may reflect a later situation, we have the commendation of several centurions, Samaritans and other despised people such as those suffering from leprosy. Lk 13:28 - 29 mentions the four corners of the earth, and in Mt.21:33-43 the privileges are given to another nation.
42. K.Haacker, "Paulus und das Judentum", Judaica 33 (1977) 161 - 77, shows that Paul's opponents could not accept his questioning of Israel's unique relationship to God as the chosen people (Rom 2:25, 29). In his relationship with Judaism Paul moved from an attitude of confrontation (1.Thess 2:14 - 16) to a more conciliatory and hopeful one (Rom 9 - 11).
43. F.Rienecker.
44. R.V.P.Furnish, The Love Command in the New Testament, London, 1973, pp123ff.
45. Cf J.Bright, The History of Israel, London 1972, pp430ff. M.Klemm op.cit p.18.
46. M.Barth, p.383 sees these deities as possibly included.
47. Celsus says Christians wall themselves off and break away from the rest of mankind (Origen, Contra Celsum 8:2).
48. H.Conzelmann, op.cit pp67 - 70 thinks that the tension between Jews and Gentiles was no longer a problem. Eph 2:11 - 22 discusses the origin of the church's unity in Jew and Gentile becoming one. The author uses the gnostic thought form of his readers to show how the church began in Christ and is held in unity by him.
49. Chrysostom, Bugenhagen and Schultess linked enmity with natural hatred in Christ's people. See Meyer.
50. Turner.
51. Tertullian Adv.Marc.5:17 claims that Marcion's motive for deleting the word "his" is to associate "flesh" with "hostility" rather than with Christ. Hippolytus, Commentary on Daniel, 4.31, also omits "his" See note 135.
52. H.Mehl-Koehnlein/

52. H.Mehl-Koehnlein in J.J.von Allmen op.cit p.251 thinks the N.T. "has inherited the larger context of the O.T." so the "strictly physical meaning is almost always transcended".
53. i.e. as creaturely weakness subject to sin (so Percy, Probleme, p.79). What Paul actually means by his negative use of flesh is debated. Augustine understood it as revolt from God. F.C.Baur as the material body in contrast to man's 'nous'. The existential view understands it as man limited to his physical capabilities, the earthly sphere; which becomes the source of sin, when man trusts in it. For details of these interpretations see R.Jewett, Paul's Anthropological Terms. A study of their use in conflict settings, Leiden, 1971, pp49 - 166. An exegete's conviction of the origin of the thought, whether Jewish, Greek or Gnostic affects his interpretation of what Paul meant by the term.
54. Lindemann, p.171.
55. See article "Flesh" by A.C.Thiselton, NIDNTT, 1:671 - 82.
56. The gospel writer may be fighting against Cerinthus and Doceticism as in the Johannine Epistles.
57. Hippolytus, Ref.8.2 - 10:11 cites the Docetists' view of Christ that "he clothed himself with the outer darkness" = the flesh (8:10.3)
58. Lindemann, p.171 cites Perels, ThLZ 76 (1951) p.394, Pokorný 183. Aquinas combined incarnation and cross. Flesh in 2:14 might be "caro assumpta" (Rom 8:3) or caro immolata (1.Cor 10:16). (Cited Barth p.302).
59. Robinson p.63 says "in his flesh" corresponds to "He himself".
60. Grassi sees a possible eucharistic reference.
61. Gniska, "In his flesh" means his death. In the context it parallels "through the cross". Cf Paul in Rom 7:4, Gal 4:4 and Rom 10:4. Since he died, the law has no more power over men. Stoeckhardt believes "in his flesh" agrees with "in the blood of Christ" and "through the cross". Salmond similarly understands crucified flesh, but Stier sees the earthly life and the incarnation.
62. Percy, Probleme, p.286. Dahl, Kurze, p.36. Christ was born an Israelite under the law (Rom 1:3, 9:5, Gal 4:4 and through being executed on the cross, he stands himself under the curse of the law and through suffering overcame the power of the law, which separated man from God (Gal 3:13, 4:5, Col 2:14).
63. Beck, "in our nature with all its weaknesses".
One must avoid the doctrine of E.Irving, for Christ took human flesh, not in sin but in weakness. He was not like Adam before the fall, but like/

like Adam since the fall, except Christ had no sin (Heb 4:15).

64. Westcott understands it as not meaning quite the same as "cross" but rather "under the conditions of our mortal life".
65. Gnilya p.141, referring to the pleonastic style of the letter.
66. J.Epstein, op.cit p.69 (on Ps 119) notes that in addition to the comprehensive term Torah, the law is also described as "way, testimony, word, precept, command, ordinance, judgement" sayings which are expressive of the fullness of the content and significance of the law.
67. Percy, Probleme, pp287f shows it is not fundamentally different from Paul which Grassi thinks is an oversimplification. The law in Ephesians is different.
68. See Romans 7 and 8.
69. M.Grant, Paul, p.48, F.Lyall, op.cit 82 shows there are three possible sources for legal metaphors in the Epistles, Roman, Greek and Jewish law.
70. See J.P.Comiskey, "All the families of the earth will be blessed". Bible Today, 83 (1976) 753 - 62. The precedent had already been set in the church's mission, subsequent to the death of Stephen and prior to Paul's mission.
71. E.P.Sanders, op.cit pp431ff.
72. F.F.Bruce, "Paul and the Law of Moses", BJRL 57 (1975) 259 - 79. "In this way for Paul the divine purpose underlying the Mosaic law is vindicated and accomplished."
73. Note Paul's series of arguments for the inferiority of the law to the gospel in Gal 3 and 4.
74. Schlatter.
75. Ep. Darnabas. 16 states the Jews have misinterpreted scripture as is seen in the fact that their temple has been destroyed.
76. Hebrews is not quite so negative, although there is a possible polemic against angels in Hebrews. In 1:4 - 2:16 the author struggles to assert the superiority of the Son over angels (so C.H.Talbert, What is a Gospel? London, 1978, p.75.)
Galatians mentions the law as given not by Moses but by angels, and it holds men in tyranny. S.Sandmel, op.cit p.10 says Gal 3:19 is vague, since it is not clear whether angels should be understood as demons.
In Galatians, the law is given by angels with the seeming intention of leading men to sin, in Romans it is given by God to lead men to a knowledge/

knowledge of sin. T.Callan "Pauline Midrash : The Exegetical background of Gal 3:19b" JBL 99 (1980) 549 - 567, says (550) it is immediately obvious that Paul is drawing upon a midrashic interpretation of the scriptural account of the bestowal of the law, since the scriptural account itself makes no reference to angels.

77. A.Ritschl, Die Entstehung der altkatholischen Kirche, Bonn, 1850, pp76f and Die christliche Lehre von der Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung, 1882.
78. F.Sieffert, Bemerkungen zum paulinischen Lehrbegriff, namentlich über das Verhältnis des Galaterbriefs zum Römerbrief, JDTh 14 (1869) 250 - 75 (cited Kübner, op.cit p.10). H.H.Ridderbos, Galatians, Grand Rapids, 1961, pp20ff says that in the Galatian letter the whole emphasis falls on the negative significance of the law. This aspect is mentioned in Romans, but in general it is the loftiness and holiness of God that is placed in the foreground. Gal 3:19, 21, 23ff shows the divine origin and plan of the law. Galatians reveals the inadequacy of the law for salvation. Romans teaches that despite the transgression of God's holy law, there is salvation.
79. See H.Kübner op.cit, p.30, Gal 3:19ff is like Job 1 and 2. Satan does the salvation work of Yahweh. O.Everling, Die paulinische Angelologie und Däemonologie, Göttingen, 1888, showed by means of parallels from Jewish apocalyptic literature that Paul believed angels stood behind the law, the government and the idols, and that redemption came when Christ defeated these powers, but that their power was still active in the struggle against the church (see Jewett op.cit p.61).
80. E.P.Sanders op.cit p.141 says the Rabbis never contemplated individuals staying in the world to come for a certain period and then having to leave, if they had only a few good deeds in excess of bad. Cf.S.Sandmel op.cit pp8 and 157f.
81. Hebrews regarded the law as the sum of offering regulations, Justin as replaced by a new law (Dial. 11 and 46, cf Dial 13, 54, 63 and Apol 32). Clement of Alexandria (Strom 88.3) regards the law for the Jews in the same way as Greek philosophy was also a pedagogue to bring Gentiles to Christ.
A.Souter, The Text and Canon of the New Testament, London, 1954, p.154 thinks Justin knew Ephesians. P.Carrington, The Early Christian Church Cambridge, 1957 vol 2.p.102 shows that Justin makes use of the Epistles of Paul, but does not mention his name. Apol 1:67 refers to the ἀποργηροεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων but not so much on Jew and Gentile distinction/

distinction, as he regarded some Greek philosophers as Christians before Christ.

82. M.Barth, "Jews and Gentiles. The Social Character of Justification in St. Paul", JEcSt 5 (1968) 241 - 67 (translated and revised from Parrhesia, Festschrift for K.Barth, Zurich (1966) p.253 says Paul uses law sometimes in the Greek sense of more than one law and that this causes confusion. See Rom 2:14 - 15 and 7:22 - 3.
83. C.Hodge is in error to say it is the law in the widest sense and therefore "includes the law which binds the heathen and which is written upon their hearts". Such a law would not cause a wall to be erected. Hodge says however "that the form in which the law was ever present to the minds of the early Christians was that contained in the Mosaic institutions."
It is true that Paul taught we cannot be saved by the law in any form (Rom 1 and 2) but the legalizers disturbing the early church would be those who insisted on the law of Moses.
84. e.g.Rienecker thinks it refers to the Mosaic law specifically as opposed to the law which the Gentiles had.
85. In contrast to Luther, Reformed theologians said that only the ceremonial law is abrogated. This disagreement continues in the 18th century. (See Rader pp78ff.)
86. e.g. Acts 15:29. Simpson regards the whole phrase in Eph 2:15 as an elliptical one for the Mosaic ordinances viewed as a statutory code. Monod thinks it is not the law, which was the basis of God's covenant with his people (Ex 24:7, 8) and preparing the economy of grace by the promise (Eph 2:12) by prophecy (Rom 3:12) and by types (Gal 4:21ff, Heb 10:11) but the law which imposed the obligations and sanctions for recompense and punishment (Rom 10:5) which Paul contrasts with grace (Rom 3:20 -3).
But would these different approaches to the law have been distinguishable in the first century?
D.Schenkel says it is "not the law with its ideal contents, which has eternal validity (Rom 7:10) rather its theocratic obligations which enforced punishment." A.Jepsen, "Israel und das Gesetz", ThLZ 93 (1968) 85 - 94 says Kultgemeinde cannot be separated from the Lebensgemeinschaft. Barth p.287 shows how the ceremonial aspect was seen by Origen, Jerome and the mediaeval tradition, which Calvin followed.
87. Abbott thinks this interpretation would require a $\tau\hat{\omega}\nu$. Mitton translates/

- translates "the law consisting of commandments, which are expressed in rigid rules". Cf Schlier.
88. Olshausen p.183 says "the unity of the law comprises a multitude of ἐντολαί ". It is not the ceremonial as such which is in mind but "to contrast it in the dividedness of its precepts with the oneness of the spirit (v.18) which reigns in the gospel".
 89. G.H.P.Thompson, Ephesians, Cambridge, 1967, cited as Thompson and ad loc.
 90. Percy, Probleme, pp250 - 2 has an excursus on the use of the genitive for connecting abstract concepts in the non-Pauline early Christian literature.
 91. Cf Clement 19:2, Ps 58:17 (LXX, "the day of tribulation") Is 1:21, 52:7, 53:5, 59:8. Pss of Solomon, 17:15 (οἱ υἱοὶ τῆς διαθήκης) 17:37 (σοφὸν ἐν βουλῇ συνεσέως).
 92. Content, as suggested by Alford.
 93. Cf the style of Ephesians and the pleonastic expression in 4:30. "The Holy Spirit of God".
 94. E.Lohse op.cit adloc, thinks Col 2:14 has influence here. But R.P.Martin, "Reconciliation and Forgiveness in Colossians", Reconciliation and Hope, N.T.Essays on Atonement and Eschatology, L.Morris Festschrift, ed. R.Banks, Exeter, 1974 ch.7 pp104 - 124 says (p.120) the Colossian passage is interpreted unconsciously by reference to Eph 2:15 whereas the meaning is clear (= a reference to the standard of the divine law).
 95. Democritus 62:4 cf 3 Macc 1:3, Josephus B.J.1:393, Philo. Gig 52 and Leg All 1:54f. See Abbott and Ewald.
 96. Cf Tacitus, Hist 5:4 "Moses introduced new religious practices quite opposed to those of other religions. The Jews regard as profane all that we hold sacred. On the other hand, they permit all that we abhor".
 97. Beck thinks it was not the moral law (Mt 5 and Rom 8:4) since this was for both Jew and Gentile. It is rather as elsewhere in the New Testament decrees or edicts which did not have the power to make alive, but could kill (Col 2:14) e.g. the sabbath, food laws, the clean and unclean distinctions, which kept Jews apart.
But the Sabbath is one of the 10 commandments. Are the other nine part of the middle wall? A moral, ceremonial distinction of laws is a difficult one and Paul appears to act inconsistently, even knowing something of situation ethics. He is free from the law, yet shaves his /

his head (Acts 18:18) circumcises Timothy (Acts 16:3) and possibly Titus (Gal 2:5). The freedom he has in Christ means that he is free to keep some aspects of the law or not. His practice of admitting Gentiles to the church, without obligation to observe Jewish ritual, would make a decision from the wider church necessary.

Harless thinks *δόγμασι* cannot refer to ceremonial laws, since their abrogation could not reconcile Gentiles to God, because they were never under them. This argument is not valid, when we remember that the context is about the relation of Jews to Gentiles. It is not until v.16 that it is clearly reconciliation to God.

98. F.Bleek, "Näher charakterisierung der Gebote dieses Gesetzes dienend". Harless connects *ἐν δόγμασιν* with *καταργήσας* only, and not with *ἐντολῶν* since there is no article. The phrase means Christ annulled the law only in respect of *δόγματα*.
99. So Abbott and Barth. Salmond says "the law is one of commandments in decrees". It is "made up of *ἐντολαί* and these expressed themselves and operated in the form of *δόγματα*". Haupt p.82 says *ἐν δόγμασιν* cannot be separated from the previous noun, for a view like Chrysostom's would need a *καινός*.
100. e.g. Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Jerome, Pelagius, Bengel (cited Rader p.13). Abbott cites Theophylact, Theodoret and Oecumenius. Abbott however thinks it would require *τοῖς δόγμασιν αὐτοῦ*. Cf Acts 16:4 and Ignatius Ad. Magn.13:1 who uses of Christian decrees.
101. Chrysostom = Christ's faith, Theodore of Mopsuestia = Christ's doctrines, (Salmond).
102. e.g. Matt 5:22 "but I say unto you".
103. So E.Schweizer, "Christianity of the Circumcised and Judaism of the Uncircumcised. The Background of Matthew and Colossians" in Jews, Greeks and Christians, Religious Cultures in Late Antiquity, essays in honour of W.D.Davies ed. R.H.Kelly and R.Scroggs, Leiden 1976 p.250.
104. See Barth, p.264, Luther was firmly against the teaching that Christ was a new legislator or new Moses, cf Galatians, Luther's works, St Louis 1964 vol 27, p.326. P.Jones, "L'Apôtre Paul. Un second Moïse pour la communauté de la nouvelle Alliance", Foi Vie 75 (1976) 36-58 believes Paul regarded himself as a new Moses. In 2.Cor 3:1 - 4:6 he suggests Paul claims that his office and mission were superior to those of Moses. In reply we can say that Paul certainly claimed to be equal with the other apostles, but never to be as unique as this.
105. Jesus' /

105. Jesus' attitude to the law was clearly something that upset the Jewish authorities. The teaching of his followers disturbed Paul enough to take him toward Damascus. But did Jesus transgress the law, disagree with it, or fulfil it? See R.Banks, Jesus and the Law in the Synoptic Tradition, Cambridge 1975. Banks suggests that Jesus' teaching has a largely accidental relation to law and Jewish custom. Jesus derives his teaching, not from law, but from his own ministry and person. Fulfil in Mt 5:17b is not establish, rather it means to fulfil all that the law pointed forward to and then to transcend and replace the law (pp203 - 26). G.S.Slogan, Is Christ the End of the Law? Philadelphia 1978 says the New Testament as a whole does not reprobate the law of the Jews.
106. See Hodge.
107. Hodge cites 2:11, 2.Cor 7:7 and Col 1:4.
108. Abbott keeps the words together. The law consisted of commandments and the definite form in which these were expressed was that of δόγματα, authoritative decrees.
109. C.C.Caragounis op.cit p.71 shows that καταργήσας is either a means to λύσας or an addition to it and with it a means to ποιήσας.
110. Robinson refers to the possibility of 4 clauses. "The enmity" is governed by the verb ἀποκτείνας (as v.16). A digression has been inserted between them.
111. Euripides, Phoen, 753, καταργέω χέρας to miss the opportunities.
112. Cited Simpson, p.61.
113. It is also found in Lk 13:7 (of a worthless use of ground).
Heb 2:14, Ep.Bar 15:5. Ignatius. Ad Eph 13:2.
114. It is the equivalent of the piel of the Hebrew לִוַּז which could give the meaning "to make of no effect" or "render inoperative". K.S.Wuest, Ephesians and Colossians in the Greek New Testament, Grand Rapids 1953 *ad loc*, understands it as restoration to a condition which had been lost.
The Greek word is derived from ἀργός which means inactive, idle, unused (Mt 20:3) useless (Wisdom 14:5) lazy (James 2:20). Cf the variants in the Latin text mentioned in section 1.3.1.
115. Lamadrid 1:232 shows it is a typically Pauline verb, but rare in secular Greek, the LXX and the rest of the New Testament.
116. C.Hodge, Romans, Philadelphia, 3rd ed 1835 *ad loc* sees a reference primarily to the moral law, which by Christ's death is "not invalidated but established. No moral obligation is weakened, no penal sanction disregarded./

disregarded. The precepts are enforced by new and stronger motives".

117. So Gaugler. E.P.Sanders, op.cit pp474ff follows K.Stendahl op.cit pp78ff that the real issues Paul deals with are what happens to law when the Messiah comes and what are the ramifications of the Messiah's arrival for the relation between Jew and Gentile. Paul had not arrived at his view of the law by testing and pondering its effects upon his conscience. It was his grappling with the question about the place of the Gentiles in the church and in the plan of God.
118. Gaugler.
119. Zerwick, p.65. Tertullian, Adv Marc 1:19 had to stress "fulfilling" since otherwise he was in danger of supporting Marcion.
120. F.Schille, p.28 cites SB 4.883, 885 that the Rabbis believed the Messiah will give a new law and that the Messianic times will only have thank offerings.
121. Cf G.F.Moore, 1.397f and Mt 5:18.
122. H.Lietzmann, Römer, Tübingen, 1933 (on 6:7) says the Rabbis believed that if a man has died, he has become free from the law and commandments. C.Hodge understood it in this way "He delivered them from the obligation of fulfilling its demands as the condition of their justification before God. In this sense we are not under the law (cf Rom 6:14, 7:4 - 6, Gal 5:18, Col 2:14). He abolished "by fulfilling its conditions ... by fulfilling its types and shadows". Similarly H.C.G.Moule, Ephesians, Cambridge, 1899 ad loc, regards Rom 7:1 - 6, 8:2, 3 and Col 1:21, 2 as the best guide. He "broke for all believers their condemning relations with the law". The law was not so much put aside, so much as believers were given a different relation to it, through the atonement. Cf M.Barth, "Der Gute Jude Paulus" in Richte unsere Füße auf den Weg des Friedens, (H.Gollwitzer Festschrift) ed Ch.Kaiser, München 1979, 107 - 137. "Das Gesetz einen Rechtsgrund und die Gabe des Lebens voraussetzt aber nicht ersetzen kann. Er wusste dass ohne Liebe Kein Gesetz und Keine Vorschrift Sinnvoll ist und bestehen kann" (132).
123. H.Conzelmann, An Outline of the Theology of the New Testament, London, 1969, p.276 says Paul fights not against legalism but against the law as a whole. But this is not true of Rom 3:31, 7:12, 14, 8:2 - 4, 13:9 etc. R.N.Longenecker, Paul, Apostle of Liberty, New York, 1964 pp.18, 86, 99f, 125 distinguishes sharply between Paul's stance for the law and his fight against legalism. Gal 5:16 - 25 and 6:15 show he is not antinomian.
124. So ! Abbott/

124. So Abbott and Robinson. It was not that which was instrumental in putting Christ to death, but Jesus by his willingness to die that killed the law. "Barrier" "hostility" "law" (as defined) are parallel descriptions. Percy, Leib pp41 - 43 compares Rom 7:4. Since the law is no longer valid for Christians, it is no longer a dividing wall between Jews and Gentiles who are in him.
125. R.Jochanan (6Shab 88b, 3rd cent AD) said "Each word, which proceeded from the mouth of the Almighty, divided into 70 tongues" cf R.Ishmael's school in the second century. See SB2:604ff and I.H. Marshall, "The Significance of Pentecost" SJT 30 (1977) 347 - 69 esp 349f. This may have been the view of sectarian Judaism and not official Judaism as Philo, Dec 33 - 49, only refers to the law given for all the nations. Josephus does not say the law was given at Pentecost.
126. Sifre, Deut 343 is an early text which implies this. It criticizes Gentiles for not keeping even those commandments, when God offered the law. A later view, in bSanh 56a - b, is that the righteous Gentile is one who keeps the 7 Noachian commandments. (E.P.Sanders op.cit p.210).
127. Philo, Quaest in Ex 2:42, De Vita Mosis 2:17ff (vol1 is about the greatness of Moses himself, king, lawgiver, prophet and priest).
128. F.C.Synge, op.cit p.23.
129. This is basic to the R.S.V and connects hostility with λύσας and wall only and not with "in his flesh". J.D.Michaelis, Paraphrasis und Anmerkungen uber die Briefe Paulian die Galater, Epheser, Philemon, Bremen and Göttingen, 1769 pp88 - 93 shows the figure of a dividing wall is common among eastern writers to describe hostility (e.g. Ephraem of Syria).
130. Bleek. Haupt.
131. Acc to E.D.Roels op.cit p.126, cf C.Hodge p.88 Robinson and Abbott. But in 1.Cor 15:26 ἐχθρὸς is the subject of the passive verb. See A.Hanson op.cit p.106. J.O.F.Murray, Ephesians, Cambridge 1914, ad loc, has enmity governed by λύσας.
132. W.Foerster TDNT 2.415 cites P.Feine op.cit p.58 for this view, but calls it a desperate measure. Paul would never have let the isolated τὴν ἐχθρὰν stand in this way.
133. A.T.Hanson, op.cit p.106. Bleek lists Theod, Oecum, Theoph, Calvin, Beza, Grotius, Rückert, and Matthys.
134. So Schlatter. However he says, we would have expected ἐν τῇ σάρκι immediately/

immediately before καταργήσας. The writer puts it in a striking manner.

135. Lindemann p.172 agrees. Abbott says the law itself cannot be enmity. 1.Cor 15:56 is not analogous, A.T.Hanson (op.cit p.106) however says it is. He understands it as "he killed the enmity which the law created".
136. So Monod against Harless, Olshausen and Gerlach.
137. As translated by Caird, although he sees it only differing from view one in style. This view is found in TR, Alford, Salmond, Nestlé and the NEB. Cf Schlier, 118.
138. "In his crucified flesh" goes more naturally with λύσας (Syr, Eth Theophylact, Oecumenius). De Wette and Meyer take with καταργήσας. As we saw earlier, it is scarcely possible to suggest enmity in the flesh of the Saviour. "He has broken down the dividing fence, the hostility in his own flesh".
139. However we preferred to take the first ἐν as instrumental and not as the second ἐν which refers to the sphere.
140. As De Wette. Meyer = It stands with emphasis (like αὐτός in v.14) at the head of the specification that now follows. He by his flesh has done away with the law.
141. Madrid 1,235.

NOTES FOR CHAPTER SIX

1. D.Smith op.cit p.41 stresses this parallel.
2. Schille p.29.
3. So Candlish. "These clauses express the purpose of the work of Christ just mentioned and describe it as twofold".
4. Masson says it is not sufficient that Christ suppressed the cause of this insurmountable opposition in abrogating the law. He must do it by a real act of creation. Cf Lamadrid 1:210 who finds the same two aspects in Rom 1:18 - 3:20 and 3:21 - 11:36 respectively.
5. Ex 37:17 although $\Upsilon \Upsilon$ is masculine and $\rho\acute{\alpha}\beta\delta\omicron\varsigma$ is feminine. Abbott says "the neuter was used in 14 to express the general characteristics of the two classes, but here where the Jews and Gentiles are conceived as concrete persons the masculine was necessary".
6. e.g. Jew and Greek. Rom 1:16, 2:9, 10; 3:9, 10:12; 1.Cor 1:24, Gal 3:28. Jew and Gentile. Rom 3:29, 9:24, Gal 2:15. (Cf Lk 2:32, Zech 8:23 and the other sheep of John 10:16). C.F.D.Moule op.cit p.62 thinks the idea of the reconciliation of all things is perhaps the hardest to accommodate to the rest of St. Paul's thought.
7. B.F.Westcott makes these two points.
8. Barth p.310. But they were only to remember their past as something unpleasant from which they had been delivered. It was not something to be perpetuated.
9. Bengel, p.79. He does not say, "men", for the Gentiles had scarcely been recognised previously as another group of fellow human beings.
10. Gen 1:26ff has $\bar{\Pi} \bar{\Psi} \bar{\Upsilon}$ and $\chi \gamma \bar{\Xi}$. LXX translates both by $\rho\omicron\iota\epsilon\iota\omega$. In Gen 12:5 $\bar{\Pi} \bar{\Psi} \bar{\Upsilon} = \kappa\tau\acute{\alpha}\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$.
11. Tertullian, adv Marc, 5:17 emphasized this, "We are his workmanship created in Christ. To make is one thing, to create is another. But he has assigned both these acts to one alone, so the same God who made us, has also created us in Christ". (Translated by E.Evans, Oxford, 1972).
12. Gnilya, pp141f speaks of an act of creation. e.g.Baptism. Cf 2.Cor 5:17, Gal 6:15, Col 3:10. Forgiveness of sins means one is created anew. Cf Midr Ps 18:1 Tanh B.no.12. Penna Proiezione, 172 shows how in the Old Testament, God has created Israel as a people. Deut 32:6, Is 43:1, 15, Mal 2:10. There is a recreation in Ps 51:12, Ps 104:30. Cf Gen 21:31 - 34, Ex 23:25 - 26.
13. Cf Is 11:10, 42:16, 49:6, 22, 60:3, Jer 16:19, Mal 1:11, Mt 12:21, Acts 9:15/

- Acts 9:15, 15:3, 21:19, 26:17, 20, 23, 28:28, Rom 11:11, 12, 13, 15:9, 27, 1.Cor 12:13, 2.Tim 4:17, Notice how Acts 15:16 - 18 is regarded as the fulfilment of Amos 9:11 - 12.
14. M.E.Boismard, Synopse des Quatre Évangiles en Français, Paris 1972, sees an influence of Paul on the final redactor of Mark, because $\kappa\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma\omega$ is found 3 times in Mark and 11 times in Paul. But K.Romaniuk "Le Probleme des Paulinismes dans l'Évangile de Marc", NTS 23 (1976 - 7) 266 - 74 shows there is not sufficient evidence.
 15. Penna Proiezione 173 and Paix 189. Barth p.308 having said that according to the Bible "only God can create and what he creates is totally new", explains it not as competition, but rather as "an execution of God's decision".
 16. 2.Cor 5:17 has the Jewish thought of a new creation through the forgiveness of sins, see P.Stuhlmacher, op.cit p.351.
For the N.T. concept of new creation, cf Gösta Lindeskog, Studien zum Neutestamentlichen Schöpfungsgedanken, Uppsala, 1952. It is also found at Qumran. Cf E.Sjöberg, "Neuschöpfung in den Toten-Meer Rollen", StTh 9 (1955) 131 - 6.
 17. Gen R 39:14, Lev R 30:3, Num R 11:2, Cant R 8:2. Pesikta 181 a-b. b.Yeb 22a, 23a, 62a, 97b - 98b, Bekh 47a. Other details in Meuzelaar op.cit pp67f and F.Mussner, op.cit pp94 - 6. N.A.Dahl, "Christ, Creation and the Church" in W.D.Davies and D.Daube, op.cit 422 - 43, p.436 finds the terminology of Jewish proselytism to be "a background but not necessarily the only background of Eph 2:11 - 22. Cf Stuhlmacher p.351. See E.Sjöberg, "Wiedergeburt und Neuschöpfung im palästinischen Judentum", StTh 4 (1950) pp44 - 85 and "Erwägungen zum ontologischen Charakter der $\kappa\alpha\iota\acute{\nu}\eta\ \kappa\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma\iota\varsigma$ bei Paulus", EvTh 27 (1967) 1 - 35 esp 22f. He has collected the Jewish texts which speak of Gentile proselytes as "a new man" and where Israel in decisive moments in history and worship is spoken of as "created" into a new man "brought near" and placed under the wings of the Shekinah.
 18. Its date is disputed. K.G.Kuhn in K.Stendahl, The Scrolls and the New Testament, New York 1957 p.261 places it in the first century AD or early 2nd century. J.Jermeias, Infant Baptism in the First Four Centuries, London, 1960 p.33 believes it is pre-Christian. G.D.Kilpatrick, "The Last Supper", Exp.T. 64 (1952 - 3) 4 - 8 regards it, p.5, as "pre-Rabbinic and as a piece of Hellenistic Jewish propaganda from Egypt. 100 - 30 BC". See Bibliography in D.Smith, pp50, 51 note 48.
 19. See/

19. See C.F.D.Moule, op.cit p.75.
20. $\sigma\alpha\rho\varsigma$ is feminine, but $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega$ as neuter could be referred to by a neuter pronoun. There is a neuter relative in Eph 5:5, cf 1.John 2:8 and Moule op.cit pp130, 1.
21. So Bleek, Schlier and Gnllka.Chrysostom understands $\epsilon\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omega$ as "union with himself". Best translates as "in himself", Christ being the surrounding element in which the new creation takes place and in which the resulting unity abides.
22. C.Hodge = "in virtue of union with him". Haupt notes it is not only through him, but in him.
23. Cf 5:30, Col 3:10, 1.Cor 11: 7.
24. Candlish, Schlier, "Den neuen, einen Menschen, zu dem die beiden Menscheits-gruppen geschaffen werden sollten, wollte Christus in sich schaffen". Cf Abbott, "Christ is himself the principle and ground of the unity".
25. Olshausen, p.186 says the phrase "creating in himself" shows Paul does not use "one new man" as a mere personification. Adam is the old man through whom all the individuals of the race receive the old man, so Christ is the new man in whom and through whom all receive the new man.
26. F.Buchsel, "In Christus" bei Paulus" ZNW 42 (1949) 141 - 58 says each passage must be taken on its merits (p.143).
27. Useful classifications of the Pauline usage of 'in Christ' are found in A.Oepke, TDNT 2:537 - 43, article on $\epsilon\nu$ and E.Best, op.cit One Body in Christ, London, 1955, pp1ff.
28. See chapter 7 note 30. E.Käsemann, Romans, London, 1980, thinks that to be in Christ is to be determined by the crucified and risen Lord (221) to stand "in a field of force" (223).
29. J.A.Allan, op.cit.
30. Schlier, pp134, 5, understands this last form as "who belongs to him". Cf F.Neugebauer, "Das Paulinische "In Christo", NTS 4 (1957 - 8) pp124 - 138 who distinguishes "in Christ" from other variants.
31. Caragounis op.cit p.156 sees no set formula.
32. C.C.Caragounis op.cit p.156 gives a list of its occurrences in Ephesians and also lists the variants. It is found 35 times, 14 in ch.1, 8 in ch.2 and 4 in ch.3.
33. Bleek emphasizes the "one".
34. Compare 1.Cor 10:17 and Gal 3:28. Mussner op.cit p.87 that "one new man"/

man" does not refer to the unity of Jew and Gentile, but to the quality of the new life of each.

35. So Meyer. Haupt suggests that "one" and "new" give two different thoughts. The humanity has not the form of the two earlier classes but has a different character.
36. e.g. Abbott.
37. See R.A. Harrisville, "The Concept of Newness", JBL 75 (1955) pp69 - 79 and J. Behn (TDNT) 3:447ff. Bruce Paul p.431 finds no distinction of meaning. Haupt, before the large discoveries of papyri, approved Trench's distinction between νέος and καινός as time and quality.
38. Lamadrid 1:238 suggests the idea of the first creation centralising on Adam, was one of the lines of thought leading to Paul's teaching on the new man. Scholars tend to see Paul's soteriology either in terms of a new humanity in Christ freed from cosmic powers, or as liberation from the bondage of the law. Ephesians 2:14 - 17 has both these aspects.
39. So E. Best op.cit p.153 and Lamadrid 1:238, cf Chrysostom (cited in Abbott). For the view of Acts, see chapter Two, note 72.
40. M. Barth, "Israel and the Church in Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians", Int. 17 (1963) 3 - 24 stresses that Ephesians is written to Gentiles "we" to "you". He insists that differences between Jew and Gentile remain and that the position of the Jew has not really changed. Schlier argues that Jews were not separate from Christ 1:12 Rom 3:21, Gal 3:16. But they were in that they rejected the Messiah. There is no such thing as a Jewish section of the church or a Gentile section. So L. Strauss, Devotional Studies in Galatians and Ephesians, New York 1957 ad loc. K.W. Clark, The Gentile Bias, "The Israel of God" pp22-29 argues that Paul did not convert people to a third race. Paul was a missionary within Judaism (27). It was Paul's basic assumption that his Gentile converts entered his own Judaism (29). J.C. Beker, Paul the Apostle, Edinburgh, 1980 p.330 goes too far when he says Israel is absorbed into the church.
41. G.J.C. Marchant, "The Body of Christ", EQ 30 (1958) 3 - 17. Origen went further and included the superior powers with men, in the one new man. Jerome followed him and this was one of the causes of the Origenist controversy, which Jerome had with Rufinus.
E.D. Roels, op.cit, p.128 thinks that none of the views like new order, spirit, church, nature is completely satisfactory, so he seeks a combination/

combination of them.

The new man is not exactly a parallel to the prodigal son as Grassi p.345 suggests. There the son remains a son, and the elder brother an elder brother. Here two separate groups, further apart than brothers are made into a body, which is a unity closer than that of brother. Brothers can live apart and still be brothers. A body must be together. The resulting unity is something different from either of the original components. It has the old ingredients, but is blended by Christ, which makes the whole entirely new.

With Grassi, compare D.N.Stanley, "Pauline Allusions to the Sayings of Jesus", CBQ 23 (1961) 26 - 39, esp 37, 8. Eph 2:4 = Lk 15:20, 1 and 5 = 24 and 32, 13 = 13 and 30, 19 = 22, 14 - 16 = 28 - 32, the father reconciles the older to the younger.

42. Haupt stresses this, but is unique in saying the term "new man" applies to Christ, because of the way in which he abrogated the law. Christ by his crucifixion is expelled from the Jewish community (Gal 3:13) where he and those who belong to him are no longer subject to the Jewish law. He is the first of this new third type. Bruce, Paul, p.431 says it is "Christ himself, not Christ in isolation from his people, but Christ in his people". (Cf Rom 6:6, 7:22, Gal 4:19). "Christ being formed in you" and Eph 2:10 "we are created in Christ Jesus." Tacitus, Ann 15. 44 says the shout of the circus crowd is "away with the third race". A.Alegro op.cit, shows that the plan of the Father is to enable humanity to enter that unity which is achieved and conveyed by the Messiah.
43. In Col 3:10 and Eph 4:23 we have ἐνδύσασθαι which is not so much being in Christ the new man, as putting on the new man.
44. So Harless.
45. B.Rey Créés, Jésus la Création Nouvelle selon St Paul, Paris 1966 pp137 - 8. Lamadrid 1:236, 7. Lamadrid follows Haupt in seeing a reference to Christ. In 1:5, 10 this might be so. But "the same body" in 3:6 is Jew and Gentile, not Christ. He dwells in this body. 3:17 The believer partakes not of Christ but of God's promise in Christ (3:6) We combine the two views of a, a new life or person, b, the church formed by Christ.
46. Some Jewish thought of the period has no Messiah, e.g. Ass.Moses. 1:18, 10:12.
47. See H.W.Kuhn, "Enderwartung und gegenwärtiges Heil. Untersuchungen zu den Gemeindeliedern von Qumran" in Studien zur Umwelt des NT. 4. Göttingen/

Göttingen, 1966, pp75 - 8. He devotes the third excursus to "Neuschöpfung in Palästinischen Judentums".

On the theme of the new creation see notes 16 and 17. The Rabbis used it in a non-eschatological sense for the act of setting free from danger of illness, from sins, or for a proselyte who entered Judaism. Schlier takes *καινός* in an eschatological sense. It means the absolute new man, who represents one new creation (2.Cor 5:17, Gal 6:15).

48. Schlier, CK 27 thinks it is not an original thought of the author, since he feels under no compulsion to explain its meaning. H.Köster, "Paul and Hellenism" in J.P.Hyatt, ed The Bible in Modern Scholarship, New York, 1965 p.193 says Paul's theological vocabulary is not that of his own theology, but is intimately related to the controversies with his own opponents. R.Jewett (op.cit) says Paul's "anthropological terms do not constitute the core of Paul's gospel, but rather are used to defend that core". (p.10). "Paul did not in general evince any interest in producing a truly consistent anthropology". (p447).
49. *ἄνθρωπος* (4:13) is used to distinguish a man from a woman or boy, *ἀνθρώπων* (2:15) to distinguish a human being from angels or lower angels.
Schlier CK 27 - 37 begins with Eph 4:13 (*ἄνθρωπος* not *ἀνθρώπων*) and proceeds to discuss numerous gnostic sources concerning *ἀνθρώπων* which he then applies to Eph 2:15.
50. D.Smith op.cit p.52.
51. Percy, Probleme, p.285 thinks it very remarkable that Schlier takes "one new man" in 2:15 as a gnostic Urmensch without referring to Gal 3:28. Meuzelaar op.cit p.84 sees a parallel. But Gal 3:28 does not clearly suggest that we form one person with him which many feel is implied in Eph 2:15.
52. R.Jewett, op.cit p.391 shows that the twofold division of flesh and body as outer, mind as inner, dominated from F.C.Baur until Bultmann. Bultmann stressed that the dualism belonged more to the Hellenistic terms than actually to Paul's theology. The inner man is the real self in contrast to the fallen self (Theology 1.p.197).
R.Reitzenstein, Mysterienreligionen, p.354 showed that similar contrasting terms are found in Hellenistic Mystery Religions and Gnosticism.
53. So W.D.Davies, J.A.T.Robinson, The Body, London, 1952 and W.D.Stacey, The Pauline View of Man, London 1956.
54. See S.S.Smalley/

54. See S.S.Smalley, "The Johannine Son of Man Sayings", NTS 15 (1968 - 9) pp278 - 301.
55. There is an enormous amount of literature, especially from the 1960's e.g. A.J.B.Higgins, Jesus and the Son of Man, London 1964. H.L.Tödt, The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition, London 1965, (German 1959 and 1963). Morna Hooker, The Son of Man in Mark, London 1967. F.Hahn op.cit. (German 1964). R.H.Fuller, The Foundations of the New Testament Christology, London 1965. See also Colpe, TDNT 8.403 - 81. More recently there are B.Lindars, Re-enter the Apocalyptic Son of Man, NTS 22 (1975 - 6) 52 - 72 and M.Black, "Jesus and the Son of Man" JNT 1 (1978) 4 - 18 and G.Vermes, "The 'Son of Man' Debate", ibid 19 - 32, and "The Present State of the Son of Man Debate" JJS 29 (1978) 123 - 34, also his appendix c, "The use of barnash/bar nasha in Jewish Aramaic", in M.Black, An Aramaic approach to the Gospels and Acts, 1967, pp 310-28.
56. F.H.Borsch, The Son of Man in Myth and History, London 1967, p.241.
57. J.T.Milik, The Book of Enoch. Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave.4, Oxford, 1976 dated as late as 270 AD. For a critique and summary of SNTS seminars (where no one agreed with Milik) see J.H.Charlesworth, "The SNTS Pseudepigrapha Seminars at Tübingen and Paris on the Books of Enoch", NTS 25 (1978 - 9) 315 - 23 and M.A.Knibb, "The Date of the Parables of Enoch. A Critical review", ibid. pp345 - 59.
58. Note the uncertainty of versions, where to begin using Adam instead of man LXX Gen 2:16, Vulgate and KJV 2:19, R.V., R.S.V. 3:17, N.E.B. 3:21, N.A.B. 4:25.
59. So Bruce, Paul, p.431. Cf M.Black, "The Pauline Doctrine of the Second Adam", SJT 7 (1954) 170 - 9 esp 175. Gen 1:27 mentions that man was created in God's image. Eph 2:10 says Christians are created in Christ Jesus. F.Festorazzi, op.cit 170 = when two Adams are mentioned the starting point is always the new Adam.
60. We compare Augustine, Tractate in Ioan Ev. 120:2, on John 19:34, who thinks the piercing of Christ's side alludes to Gen 2:21, 2 and depicts the institutions of the sacraments and birth of the church. Cf De Civ Dei, 22:17. See M.Barth, Die Taufe, ein Sakrament, Zurich 1951 pp407 - 18.
61. The Life of Adam, 3:1ff, 29:1ff. In Philo. Conf Ling 146 he is created after the image of God. He is one with the logos the $\eta\pi\omega\tau\epsilon\rho\acute{o}\nu\sigma\alpha\varsigma\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ De Opic 139, Agric 51, Somn 1:215 speaks of two temples of God, one is the universe with a priest, who is the real Man. See W.Bousset, Hauptprobleme der Gnosis, Göttingen, 1907 pp194f/

pp194f.

62. b.Sanhedrin, 38a. Pesikta Rabbati 115a says he is as long as the earth. Gen R.8:1 that he reaches from heaven to earth. Cf Num R 13:12. b. Erubim 18a and b.Berakhah 61a.
63. In PesiktaR1b, Rabba Aibu said "at this time the stature of the first man Adam was shortened and it was made a hundred ells".
64. W.D.Davies, p.38. Cf W.O.E.Oesterley and T.H.Robinson, Hebrew Religion: Its Origin and Development, London, 1952, p.333.
65. J.L.Sharpe, 111, "The Second Adam in the Apocalypse of Moses", CBQ 35 (1973) pp35 - 46.
66. Cf Vergil's 4th Eclogue. Lucretius' De Rerum Natura. H.Gunkel, op.cit pp367 - 71. R.Scroggs, The Last Adam, Philadelphia, 1966, pp23ff. Ephesians in one sense sees the new creation as having occurred in Christ, Cf John's realised eschatology.
67. e.g. Jub. 19:24. See J.de Fraine, Adam et son Lignage, Bruges, 1959, pp74ff and 113ff. Different individuals were conceived as being derived from, or attached to different parts of Adam's body, hair, nose, ear etc. (Ex R.40:3, cf Philo Op Mundi, 136). His descendants are included in his gigantic golem (Haggadah on Ex 31:2 and Job 38:4). A predetermined number of souls were placed in his body. When they are all born, the Messiah will come. This idea was based on Is 57:16 and is found in bYeb 62a, 63b, Niddah 13a, Gen R.24:4, Lev.R.15:1 etc, see R.Jewett, op.cit p.243.
68. J.L.Sharpe, op.cit.
69. F.H.Borsch, op.cit p.256n, cf The Odes of Solomon and John 3:13.
70. We retain the phrase for although J.W.Rogerson "The Hebrew Concept of Corporate Personality, A reexamination," JTS (ns)²¹ (1970) 1 - 16 is correct that it is used rather widely and ambiguously by scholars, no other term is any more satisfactory.
71. See E.Best, op.cit p.184ff, cf the Egyptian god Osiris. No single part of nature was his own, yet he was immanent in the natural world.
72. See H.A.W.Robinson, The Hebrew Concept of Corporate Personality, Berlin, 1936 pp49 - 62. J.L.Pedersen, Israel, 1V, Its Life and Culture, Oxford, 1947. A.Schweitzer, The Mysticism of St Paul the Apostle, London 1931. J.J.Meuzelaar, Der Lieb des Messias. Eine exegetische Studie über den Gedenken von Lieb Christi in den Paulusbriefen. Assen, 1956 p.9. A.R.Johnson, The One and the Many, Cardiff, 1942. R.P.Shedd, Man in Community, London, 1958.
73. A.Schweitzer op.cit pp104f. He believed Paul's theology developed from apocalyptic/

apocalyptic materials and had as its centre the idea of entrance into a mystical bodily unity with Christ, through dying and rising with him.

74. A.E.J. Rawlinson, "Corpus Christi" in Mysterium Christi ed G.K. Bell and A. Deissmann, London, 1930, pp225 - 44.
75. Schlief, 92, sees more of a Jewish background for new man, Eph 2:15, than when he wrote CK. He traces it to Jewish Adam speculation influenced by the oriental gnostic primal Man redeemer myth. His evidence includes Philo, Praem 124f and De Spec Leg. 1:210f.
76. There is corporate sharing in heaven, despite the bad, in Rabbi Meir = b.Kidd 36a and M. Sanhedrin 10:1.
77. So Olshausen. We receive the old man from Adam, the new man from Christ.
78. See F.H. Borsch op.cit pp246ff. Cf W.L. Knox, St Paul and the Church of the Gentiles, Cambridge, 1939, pp160ff who sees Stoic-Orphic traditions influencing Hellenistic Judaism.
79. Eph 1:23 cf Merklein Amt p.87. He understands body in Eph/Col as the body of the crucified Christ. All men in Christ by the cross constitute the church. For the slight distinctions which he finds between Ephesians and Colossians see pp83ff.
80. S. Mowinckel, He that cometh, Nashville, 1954, pp422f. Allusions to the primordial man are sometimes seen in Ez 28 and Job 15:7ff. Rabbinical Judaism, in emphasizing the fall, had glorified the earthly Adam but in Hellenistic circles Phoenician influence encourages the contrast of Adam with the ideal man. H.M. Schenke, Der Gott-"Mensch" in der Gnosis, Göttingen, 1962 finds three separate ideas of a God-Man, a, the divine-giant whose body makes up the cosmos, b, the paradise king Urmensch who was placed in the garden with certain tasks and c, the gnostic divine man. a and c were not linked until the rise of Manichaeism (p.154). E. Schweizer, Die Kirche als Leib Christi in den paulinischen Homologumena believes Judaic Adam speculation took 3 forms, a. an angelic being (Ez 28:12f) b. Wisdom (Wisdom 10:1ff) and c. a patriarch figure who represents all men in the tribe, e.g. Philo, Syr Bar 78:4, Apoc Ab 23:8. Schweizer thinks c had the greatest effect on the Pauline $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$ idea.
81. D. Smith, op.cit p.42. The Rabbis explained the difference in spelling of $\gamma\chi\iota$ and $\gamma\chi$ in Gen 2:7 and 2:19 by saying that the yods in 2:7 refer to two creations of man, one being for the age to come. (midr Ps 139:5, Gen R. 14:5). R. Scroggs op.cit pp55, n 92 believes/

- believes the idea goes back to the first century AD. See also pp23ff and J.Jervell, Imago Dei, Göttingen, 1960.
82. W.D.Davies, p.47 says it is easier to explain Philo's idea of the heavenly man from a Platonic background than it is from a Rabbinic one.
 83. Noah was fashioned not like the earthly but like the divine Adam and deemed worthy of sovereignty over the new world as the heavenly man had been over the first creation. Cf Philo, Quaest on Gen 11:56 (on Gen 9:1 - 2).
 84. e.g. The Hermetic Poimandres, reflects this. See C.H.Dodd, The Bible and the Greeks, pp99ff.
 85. F.H.Borsch, op.cit and The Canaanite and Gnostic Son of Man, London 1970. G.R.Driver, Canaanite Myths and Legends, Edinburgh, 1956.
 86. F.H.Borsch, Son of Man, pp75ff. K.M.Fischer pp70ff. R.C.Zachner, Hinduism, Oxford 1962. Indian text Mundaka Upanished, 2:3,4.
 87. According to R.Reitzenstein. See his Das iranische Erlösungsmysterium Bonn, 1921 and Die hellenistischen Mysterien religionen. C.Colpe op.cit pp203ff shows that care must be taken with Reitzenstein's evidence which is centuries and a thousand miles apart. R.C.Zachner, The dawn and twilight of Zoroastrianism, London 1961 p.347 says the "Erlösungsmysterium" is largely Reitzenstein's invention.
 88. See F.H.Borsch, op.cit pp75f. E.Käsemann, Leib und Leib Christi follows Reitzenstein in believing that the divine Urmensch figure and the Aeon giant figure, whose body includes the elect, came together in pre-Christian times in the Iranian figure of Gayomard and in early gnosticism.
 89. Sanders p.78 shows that Dibelius p.17 in discussing Col 1:15 - 20 finds it difficult to explain how the Iranian myth of the primal man redeemer might have come into pre-Christian Judaism. M.Schenke op.cit pp72ff believes the divine man motif in Gnosticism stems from speculative interpretation of Gen 1 - 2 rather than from Iranian or Indian religion.
 90. Orphic Fragments 167 - 88 in O.Kern, Fragmenta Orphicorum, Berlin, 1922 pp201 - 2. See K.M.Fischer p.73. Aristotle, Pol.3.128b, 1 - 10 speaks of the multitude of citizens belonging to $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma \ \alpha\upsilon\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\varsigma$ thus showing that the images of $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma \ \alpha\upsilon\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\varsigma$ and $\epsilon\nu \ \sigma\omega\mu\alpha$ could be interchanged in certain Greek traditions.
 91. In the Apocalypse of Adam 64 (Codex VMH) the first couple were formerly superior to the God who created them. They fell at the instigation of the creator-god/

the creator-god and became aeons.

92. The Letter of Egnostus is found in Codex 3 (and in poor condition in 5) from Nag Hammadi. It speaks of the self-begetter (Autopator) who causes an immortal bisexual man to make his appearance. (77). For the NH texts in English, see J.M.Robinson, ed The Nag Hammadi Library Leiden/New York 1977.
93. Hippolytus, Ref.6:3 says they worship a man called Adamas.
94. ibid. 9:8ff (on Elkhassai). See W.Foerster 2.136ff for Mandaean views.
95. Hippolytus. Ref 5:8,9f. E.Yamauchi, Pre-Christian Gnosticism, London 1973, p.70. G.Quispel, Der gnostische Anthropos und die Judische Traditions, Eranos Jahrbuch 22 (1953) 195 - 234.
96. Details in Foerster.
97. Schlief CK., p.29 notes a Manichaean Song "We praise and extol and glorify greatly drōš(h)roé, the perfect man, the adamantine appearing pillar that bears the world and fills the all". Dibelius (on Eph 4:13) inclines to the view of Schlief that the idea of the new man is perhaps to be traced back to the influence of gnostic anthropos mythology. See G.Widengren, Mani and Manichaeism, London 1965 and C.H.Dodd, The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel.
98. H.M.Schenke, op.cit p.155 claims that it first appears in Mani.
99. Schlief p.92 sees Jewish Adam speculation influenced by the Oriental Gnostic Primal Man Redeemer Myth, e.g. as in Philo.
100. But we cannot dismiss the gnostic possibility completely. L.E.Cerfaux, The Church in the Theology of St Paul, New York, 1959 pp368ff says we may be able to explain the new man and perfect man otherwise, but this is not to say that gnostic terminology cannot lie behind the conception of the church in Ephesians. "We have no reason for supposing that Paul should have been influenced by circles so distant from the one in which he lives, when he had all the materials for such a theory close at hand, if he had wished to use them. The Persian myth would certainly help to explain the antimony of Paul's conception of Christ as the body and head of the church, because the Anthropos, since his fall, actually comprised the world in his own being".
101. S.Hanson, The Unity of the Church in the New Testament. Colossians and Ephesians, Uppsala 1946, p.148 suggests that "one man", "one body", "one spirit" mean the same. Roels op.cit p.128 says that suggestions like a new order, spirit, church, new nature are not completely satisfactory, so its meaning is probably a composite one.
102. See Gaugler on the relationship of 2:15 to 4:13.
103. The Valentinians/

103. The Valentinians (acc to Hippolytus Ref 6:35, 3 - 4) call Jesus the new man, because he is the product of the Demiurge and Sophia, unlike the descendants of Adam, who stem from the Demiurge alone.
104. Cf verse 22 and Barth p.307.
105. See E.Best op.cit p.152.
106. J.A.T.Robinson, op.cit. L.S.Thornton, The Common Life in the Body of Christ, Westminster 1942 p.55 thinks Paul's use of one new man is as a name for the church "the one man in whom we all are included". Cf W.D.Stacey, op.cit.
107. E.Best op.cit p.153.
108. S.T.Coleridge showed F.D.Maurice the ecclesia as "the great family of Christ to which all men belonged, as St Paul had preached to the Romans and the Ephesians in his great vision of one body and many members. See F.Higham, Frederick Denison Maurice, London 1947, p.26.
109. So Lindemann, p.171, since the following words as far as *σταυρῶ* have been added by the author. Schenkel says "making peace" recaps v.14 and expresses how in the creation of Jew and Gentile into a third, the divine intention to bring the hatred to an end is fulfilled.
110. Monod. Contrast Phinehas (Num 25:12) who through violence became a peacemaker.
111. Lamadrid, 1:238.

NOTES FOR CHAPTER SEVEN

1. So Beet.
2. Salmond.
3. Hodge, "The second part of Christ's purpose is expressed in these words". M.Warren, The Christian Mission, London 1951, p.18, says God is at the point where vertical and horizontal intersect, "The place in which man meets his fellows is the place where God meets man".
4. E.Käsemann, "Some thoughts on the Theme, the Doctrine of reconciliation in the New Testament" in The Future of our religious past, ed J.M.Robinson, New York, 1971 pp49 - 64, minimizes the role of reconciliation in Paul's theology. For a reply see J.A.Fitzmyer, Reconciliation in Pauline Theology, in No Famine in the Land, Missoula 1975 ed J.W.Flanagan and A.W.Robinson. Studies in honour of J.L.Mackenzie pp155 - 77 esp 163ff. Since the theme is found in 2.Cor 5 and echoed in Rom 11:19, it cannot be dismissed as mere deuterio-Pauline.
 R.Bultmann op.cit 1.p.85 says reconciliation is peculiarly Pauline.
 L.Goppelt, Christologie und Ethik, Göttingen, 1968 pp148ff.
Versöhnung in der Welt des neuen Testaments asks "where in the NT we find it?" He replies that although forgiveness is found in many places, reconciliation is only found in Paul. p.148 So Penna, Paix p.192.
5. The passages are discussed in J.Thompson, "The Doctrine of Reconciliation" Bib.Theol 27 (1977) pp43 - 53. J.Dupont, op.cit The word is also found in Acts 12:22(D). See chapter Three n.57.
6. J.Michls, "Die Versöhnung Kol.1:20", ThQ120 (1948) 444 - 62 shows that for Paul it takes on a soteriological aspect, the overcoming of cosmic and human hostility. Gnllka says that for Paul reconciliation is, essentially being made right with God. What is new to Ephesians is the "both in one body".
7. I.H.Marshall in a lecture at Glasgow University, November 29th, 1978, "The Meaning of Reconciliation" in R.A.Guelich (ed), Unity and Diversity in N.T.Theology, Grand Rapids 1978, pp117 - 132.
 Note the paucity of references in Greek Lexicons.. Fitzmyer op.cit p.162 shows that all the passages on reconciliation are striking for the absence of any allusion to expiation, propitiation or even sacrifice. There is nothing in Pauline to suggest a cultic or liturgical background. He summarizes (p.156) the ways Paul looked at the/

at the effects of the Christ event, salvation, expiation, ransom, sanctification, freedom, justification, transformation a new creation and reconciliation.

8. See T.W.Manson, On Paul and John, London 1963 p.51.
9. See Tosephtha T.Shequalim 1.6(174). SB 3:519. F.Buchsel, article καταλλάσσω TDNT 1:254. Goppelt, op.cit p.149.
10. Goppelt, ibid 150.
11. F.Mussner, Contributions made by Qumran to the understanding of the Epistle to the Ephesians in J.Murphy-O'Connor, op.cit pp159 - 178 cited from p.169.
12. See Chapter Four, note 74.
13. T.W.Manson, op.cit pp50ff has a useful summary. He mentions the derivations found in the New Testament, ἀντάλλαγμα Mk 8:37 ἀπαλλάσσω Heb 2:15 (to free). The middle means to depart (Acts 19:12), to escape (Lk 12:58), the passive to be reconciled (Mt 5:24). M.Barth shows that the simple form of ἀλλάσσω originally meant to change or exchange, especially money, or to turn from hostility to friendship. The passive therefore can mean "to be reconciled".
Compounds of the verb in the New Testament deal with man's relationship to God. The exceptions are Acts 7:26 and 1.Cor 7:11.
The most common prefix to form a compound verb is κατά which is one of the two prepositions found in Eph 2:16. καταλλάσσω is found in Xenophon Anab 1:6:1. "For Orontas had made war on Cyrus and had become his friend again" (καταλλαγεῖς). Thucydides 4:59.4 has καταλλαγήναι "So let us now endeavour by setting forth our conflicting claims to be reconciled with each other".
14. Eadie says the radical idea of the word is to cause enmity to cease, to make up friendship again. The mode, time and form of the reconciliation must be learned from the context.
15. The composite form of a verb usually has the same meaning, although it can have a slight increase in emphasis. See R.Morgenthaler, Statistik des neutestamentlicher Wortschatz Zurich 1958, pp161-2 for a complete list of NT double composites. It seems clear that the prefixing of prepositions can change the meaning of composite nouns, adjectives and verbs. P.Feine, op.cit 563 and 572 sees a further intensification of the verb in Eph 2:16.
16. Masson, Kolossier, adloc, thinks the length of the longer word is required for the rhythm.
17. As ἀποδίδωμι, the reestablishment of a previously existing peace and unity/

and unity (Passow, Harless, Olshausen (cited by Eadie who prefers the intensive view) Chrysostom, Theophylact, Calvin, Ellicott, J.B. Lightfoot, Holtzmann, Liddell and Scott, B.Weiss. (Details in J.MacPherson and Barth). This is the literal meaning with $\alpha\pi\omicron$ and is true of the Jews. But it is not true of Gentiles (Except Adam, from whom all are descended and who was once at peace with God). MacPherson, Eadie and Meyer are to be preferred with Feine, in saying it is intensification.

18. Cf Simpson. Gaugler is not certain whether $\alpha\pi\omicron$ has special meaning here or whether it means restoration of the original belonging to God. Estius understood restitution, but Luther argued that reconciliation can only be between such, who at one time stood near to one another. (Cited Gaugler from Neutestamentliches Wörterbuch, Hamburg 1962 p.195).
19. The Hittite covenants with their vassals (i.e. Suzerainty Covenants) during the second millenium BC, are often argued to be closer in form to The O.T. covenants than the first millenium ones from Mesopotamia. See V.Koreséc, Hethitische Staatsverträge Leipzig 1931 and G.E. Mendenhall, "Covenant Form in Israelite Traditions" BA 17 (1954) 26-46 50 - 76 (reprinted as Law and Covenant in Israel and the Ancient Near East, Pittsburgh, 1955).
20. Tertullian, Adv Marc.5:17 comments "that he might reconcile both unto God, even the God, whom both races had offended". Dibelius relates "both" to Christ and to the Church as his body. The latter is suggested by its resumption in the phrase "in one body".
21. Cf H.J.Schoeps, op.cit p.237ff and J.Munck, op.cit.
22. R.J.Raja, "The Kingdom of God and Reconciliation" Biblehashyam 1 (1975) 291 - 301 argues that since kingdom is an embracing term, to be in the kingdom means to be reconciled.
23. See P.Benoit, L'Hymne pp245ff, Colossians understands it in the sense of "sum up" (1:20). Christ is the head of all things, (including the celestial powers). Headship could be achieved by force, but he secures it by his death.
Sanders pp86f says that if we accept there was a developing pre-Christian myth in Judaism, we can then argue that the Christ event provided the motif for the next stage, where cosmic reconciliation was attributed to the redeemer figure, and also "argue that the view that the reconciliation had already taken place or was now in the process of being realised ... could only be Christian".
24. It is in contrast to "two" and "both". Schlier takes on body (Christ's human/

human body) as synonymous with one new man, D.Smith with ἐν ὧν
 Mitton reads into the text when he says that one body "emphasizes the corporate obedience to God and their sense of oneness with one another in God's purpose". Cf 1.Cor 6:16 where to join a harlot is to become one body with her. R.Schnackenburg, "L'Idée de corps du Christ dans la lettre aux Éphésiens : Perspective pour notre temps". In Paul de Tarse op.cit pp664 - 685, parallels one single body and one single spirit.

25. Dibelius and E.Percy, Leib p.281 accept this. E.Käsemann Leib, 191ff thinks it is the cross body, eucharist body and church concept. See P.Stuhlmacher, op.cit 372.
26. Cf Meuzelaar, op.cit p.57.
 A.W.Slaten, Qualitative Nouns in the Pauline Epistles, Chicago 1918 shows that nouns with the article are restrictive or generic, those without it are indefinite or qualitative.
27. Haupt found that one half of the commentators, e.g.Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, Bengel, Harless, Hofmann, Wohlenberg, Soden and Weiss see a reference to the body of Christ, the other half, e.g.Ambrosiaster, Oecumenius, Bleek, Holtzmann, Meyer, Beck, Kloppen see a reference to the church of Christ.
 Von Soden understands the transfigured body of Christ, which Haupt rejects, since it has been crucified.
 Those holding a literal view as Haupt did, include Percy, Probleme pp281, 289, 317, 382. Leib, pp29, 39, 44, E.Schweizer, op.cit p.246. Cerfaux op.cit 267, 277ff. H.Schlier, p.139 "in dem Leibe Christi am Kreuz, der nun Juden und Heiden auf sich genommen und Gott versöhnt hat, virtuell und potentiell die kirche da ist". C.Kearns, "The Church the body of Christ according to St Paul", Ir.Eccl. Record, 90 (1958) 1 - 11 145 - 57, 91 (1959) 1 - 15 and 313 - 327, says p.317 that the basic doctrine is that Christians are in Christ, vitally united as a result of faith and baptism. The head (p.326) is already in heaven and the body the church is on her way to join him in the final consummation. (Two comments can be made. a. Is this Paul's view of baptism? and b. Ephesians teaches that Christians are already in the heavenlies and raised with Christ.) Schnackenburg op.cit.Eric G.Jay, The Church : Its changing image through twenty centuries, vol 1
The First Seven Centuries, London, 1977 sees a "corporate or inclusive personality". Meuzelaar, op.cit p.52 thinks that in Eph 2:16 the explanation of the body as the one which died on the cross is not sufficient./

- sufficient. R.Jewett, op.cit, 202 shows how until this century, the term was discussed under ecclesiology because of the phrase "body of Christ" and that only comparatively recently has it been realized that the word has a theological significance of its own.
28. Cf D.M.Park, "The Interpretive Value of Paul's Metaphors", SE Asia Journal of Theology 18 (1977) 37 - 40 shows that historical remoteness, inconsistency, mixing and multiple meanings tend to diminish the interpretative worth of Paul's metaphors. NTA 22 (1978) 845. But is not the fault mainly with us, for taking the metaphors further than Paul intended?
 29. Cf Col 1:24 which is less likely to have in mind the apocalyptic sufferings of the Messiah than the idea of solidarity with Christ of Phil 3:10, Gal 2:20 and 6:14, which is a view, we know Paul had. Christ left some suffering for his servant Paul and for other Christians, rather than endure all and leave none for his followers. Cf R.J.Bauckham "Col 1:24 again : The Apocalyptic Note", EQ 47 (1975) 168 - 70. H.Schlier, pp91, 2 says body in Paul is used a. for the human fellowship and the cosmos, b. for members caring for one another and as opposite to head.
 30. Cf Acts 9:4, 22:7. See Meuzelaar, op.cit p.13, J.A.T.Robinson, op.cit pp57f and E.Mersch, Le Corps Mystique du Christ Paris, 1949 pp60 - 153. F.Mussner, Christus das All, p.139. Mussner sought to answer M.Dibelius that the conversion account in Acts 26:14ff was stylized by Luke along Euripides' lines (see R.Jewett op.cit p.246).
 31. J.A.T.Robinson, op cit pp47. F.Mussner op.cit pp119ff, L.S.Thornton op.cit pp335ff. A.E.Rawlinson, op.cit and L.Cerfaux op.cit p.263 see the eucharistic body of Christ.
 32. e.g. Percy, Leib, p.29 and Probleme 109 and J.A.T.Robinson p.43ff.
 33. J.A.T.Robinson, ibid p.78.
 34. e.g. C.F.D.Moule, ed The Significance of the Message of the Resurrection for Faith in Jesus Christ, London 1968. C.F.Evans, Resurrection and the New Testament, London 1970 and D.H.van Daalen, The Real Resurrection, London 1972.
 35. Examples in J.J.Meuzelaar op.cit pp150 - 68 of its use in ancient literature. L.Deimel, Leib Christi, Freiburg 1940 showed that the metaphor of the body is widespread in world literature. He argued that it only means a society belonging to Christ. Paul, of course, often uses "body" in its normal physical sense. (Gal 6:17)
 36. J.A.Allan, op.cit p.62.
 37. J.A.T.Robinson/

37. J.A.T. Robinson, in reviewing R.H. Gundry, Soma in Biblical Theology, Cambridge, 1976 in JTS 28 (1977) pp163ff.
38. See Jer 50:6, 17; Is 5:7. Cf E. Best op.cit pp98 - 100. Robinson p.65 = "it is not the human body of the Lord Jesus. Here (Eph 2:16) St Paul is speaking of that larger Body of the exalted Christ of which he has already declared that it is His fulness or completion" and will later declare "there is one body and one Spirit" (4:4).
39. E. Best op.cit p.100. "Body" as a concept is not often found in the New Testament apart from in Paul.
40. Abbott and J. Meuzelaar, op.cit p.56.
41. Gaugler goes as far as to say it is "völlig sinnlos".
42. Cf C. Chavasse, The Bride of Christ, London, n.d., pp67ff. He traces the origin of the argument in Eph 5:22 - 23 to Genesis 2, rather than connecting it with Yahweh's marriage with Israel. But Ephesians only quotes Gen 2 to clinch an argument that he has already established (see E. Best op.cit pp180f). The idea of the marriage of Yahweh and Israel supports what we often find in Ephesians, that the writer is fond of using Isaiah (cf 54:5).
43. J.A.T. Robinson op.cit p.9, "the keystone of Paul's theology". He suggests that the concept brings together all of Paul's great theological themes and is the most distinctive characteristic of his theology.
44. Cf J. Ruef, Paul's First Letter to Corinth, Harmondsworth 1971, p.129. L. Cerfaux, op.cit pp239 - 43 and B. Daines, "Paul's use of the analogy of the Body of Christ, with special reference to 1. Cor 12", EQ 50 (1978) pp71 - 8. R.Y.K. Fung, "Some Pauline Pictures of the Church" EQ 53 (1981) 88 - 107.
45. L. Ramaroson, "L'Eglise corps du Christ dans les écrits pauliniens simples esquisses", Science et Esprit, 30 (1978) 129 - 41 believes that in the earlier epistles the believer is united with Christ, but not "a complete unification or identification". In the Captivity Epistles, it is the universal church which grows, is built up and has Christ as the head or principle of life.
P. Benoit, Corps (ET in Jesus and the Gospel, vol.2, London 1974. pp51 - 92) argues that in Colossians and Ephesians we have the same fundamental Pauline doctrine of the body of Christ, modified by fusion with the themes of head and pleroma and made clearer perhaps by new expressions but still substantially the same. N. Koulomzine, "Images of the Church in St Paul's Epistles", St Vlad Theol, Q 14 (1970) 5-27 similarly/

similarly sees some development, but no real difference from the earlier Paul. E.D.Roels op.cit p.101 shows that because the Captivity Epistles deal with the relationship of the church to Christ, it is possible for a new element to enter the discussion of body, that of Christ as the head.

46. Bruce, Paul, p.421. J.Reuss "Die Kirche als Leib Christi und die Herkunft dieser Vorstellung beim Apostel Paulus", BZ2 (1958) 103 - 27, believes Paul came to the idea of Christ's headship through establishing the Lordship of Christ over every power. This was prompted by the Colossian heresy and then applied to the head's relationship to the Church.
47. Percy, Leib pp20 and 46 minimizes the difference between Colossians/Ephesians and the earlier Paul by saying it is just a picturesque expression of "in Christ". H.Schlier, CK pp39ff also sees as different. Romans and 1.Cor just have the Stoic concept, but Eph and Col the gnostic as well, with the universal church portrayed as a body, and with body-head relationship. E.Käsemann finds a gnostic background for the concept in the earlier epistles also. (See note 8b).
48. E.Lohmeyer, op.cit ad loc, followed by Dibelius, Käsemann and W.L.Knox, sees Colossians as different in theology because there the church encompasses the whole cosmos. (See E.Best op.cit p.115.)
49. See Galen, de const artis medicae and de usu partium 12:4 ed Kuhn (selections in J.B.Lightfoot, op.cit pp198f). Galen lived cir AD130-200 The author of Ephesians, especially if he were Paul, would know Luke and get medical knowledge from him, although there is no trace of these particular ideas in the Lukan writings. See W.K.Hobart, The Medical Language of Luke, Dublin 1882.
50. Ephesians 2:20 calls the Apostles the foundation, but stresses that Christ is the cornerstone. If the apostles were the head, what would Christ be? Meuzelaar op.cit p.163, however insists that in the wide use of the metaphor, we cannot say the head receives a special position. The head is only a member next to other members. Meuzelaar is contradicted by Eph 4:16.
51. See Ridderbos op.cit p.380. F.Mussner, Christus das All und die Kirche pp155f shows how head and body depict human society (e.g. Curtius, Historia, 10.9.1ff) but this cannot explain the "soma" ecclesiology of Christians related to one another. This thought was encouraged by the Eucharist (137ff). In Col and Eph, the Christology encourages the imagery (p.153).
52. It is /

52. It is perhaps to quibble with the author to say that in fact heads do grow, but not so much as the rest of the body. R.A.Knox, St Paul's Gospel, London 1953, p.84 suggests that the idea is that the body as it develops, is growing up more and more into a due proportion with the head.
53. H.Ridderbos, op.cit, p.380 is convinced it is not the literal body of Christ, because of this idea of growth. "Christ cannot be thought of as a (subordinate) part of his own body, which is involved in the process of growth".
54. L.Cerfaux, op.cit p.342 rightly points out that we should not worry too much about physiology. Paul did not claim to be a medical expert. Cf Philo, Quaest in Ex, 2:117 "the eternal word of the eternal God is the head of all".
55. Anne Ross, Paran Celtic Britain, London, 1974, p.95.
56. ibid, p.74. Paul was not far from the Celtic region of North Galatia and may have evangelized them, if we accept the "North Galatian Theory".
57. Robinson p.88 and W.Bieder, Brief an die Kolosser, Zurich 1943 *ad loc* consider that since believers are in his body, they are filled with divine powers. See E.Best op.cit p.118.
58. W.Hendriksen, Ephesians, London 1972 pp188f on 4:4. Penna, Proiezione 173 thinks the passage is too Christological for it to refer solely to the community as a social body. He parallels Col 1:22 reconciled in the body of his flesh.
59. Taking the verb with a passive meaning. See I.de la Potterie, "Le Christ Plérôme de L'Eglise," Eph 1:22 - 23 ", Biblica 58 (1977) 500-21.
60. R.Bultmann, op.cit 1:302 says the union of believers into one body with Christ, now has its basis not in their sharing the same supernatural substance, but in the fact that in the word of proclamation Christ's death and resurrection becomes a possibility of existence in regard to which a decision must be made. The incarnation is present and active in the Christian proclamation. Jewish apocalypticism has been historicized (1.307).
Bultmann's holistic view has been questioned by R.H.Gundry op.cit and R.Jewett op.cit p.211, who says Bultmann has turned $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$ into its virtual opposite, a symbol for that structure of individual existence which is essentially non-physical.
61. Mt 6:25 has a body and soul in correspondence, suggesting body is more than simply material. In 1.Cor 6, "body" and "you" are used interchangeably.
62. J.Jeremias/

62. J.Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, London, 1966, p221 sees significance in flesh and blood being the component parts of the sacrament.
63. J.A.T.Robinson in his review of Gundry op.cit p.164.
64. E.Best in review of Gundry's work, Durham University Journal, vol69 (1977) p.282 says "we ought not to draw rigorous lines between them, as if man was made up of two or more distinct parts".
E.Schweizer, "The Church as the Missionary Body of Christ", NTS 8 (1961 - 2) pp1 - 11 (Neotestamentica pp317 - 29) stresses the functional aspect. In his body, the church, he is permeating the world.
65. Homer uses of the corpse, Iliad 3:23. (Σέπας = a living body). It is used in the 5th century BC of the torso and then of the whole body. See articles in IDNTTI 232 - 42 and TDNT 7.1024 - 44. The latter is by E.Schweizer, see his Die Kirche als Leib Christi in den paulinischen Homologumena und Antilegomena.
66. Orphic Fragment 21a. See J.J.Meuzelaar, op.cit p.2.
67. Plato, Timaeus 30b - 34b likens the cosmos to a Σῶμα .
68. Orphic Fragment 168.
69. Livy 2:32 has the fable of Menenius Agrippa. The idle belly is supported by its members, the hands, mouth and teeth. They decide to starve the body they serve, but find that in so doing they harm themselves. The fable is taken from Aesop and applied to the social order. Hellenism made wide use of this tale to assert the solidarity of the classes of society and to express the unity of a society, army or any kind of organization. E.Best One Body in Christ, pp215 - 225 Appendix C gives a full discussion of Greek attitudes of contrasting a body over against its organs.
A Stoic connection can be seen in the Household Codes of Colossians and Ephesians. J.E.Crouch, The Origins and Intention of the Colossian Haustafel, Göttingen, 1972 pp71f shows that Stoic Codes were not clearly formulated, although possibly they had lists of duties for husbands, wives, fathers and children. The Jewish Codes which differ most from the Stoic material show the greatest similarity with the basic Haustafel scheme of Colossians (p.83). Crouch suggests that as the Jews spread they made use of Noachian laws (pp92f of A cts 15).
In the propaganda of Hellenistic Judaism, they used the Hellenistic practice of listing social duties in the form of a code and used anything of Hellenism which was morally superior. It was this kind of material/

material that was used by Colossians and Ephesians (pp146ff).

70. E. Bevan, Later Greek Religion, London 1927 pp32, 84, 5 gives many examples, e.g. Sextus Empiricus, Adv. Mathem, 9:78, 9. Cf Epictetus 2:10.4. "If foot or hand could reason they would work for the good of the whole". 3:4 ἐνὶ τούτοις εἰ τοῦ κόσμου καὶ πέρος αὐτοῦ
Cf Cicero, De Officiis 1:126, 7 and 3:22. Xenophon, Memorabilia 2:3.18f. Marcus Aurelius, Med 2:1 elaborated with reference to feet, hands, teeth (Cf 7:13 and Ep 11:5.26 and Seneca, De Ira 2:31.6).
71. Seneca, Ep. 95:52, "membra sumus corporis magni" and De Clementia 1:5.1. Nam si quod adhuc colligitur tu animus reipublicae tuae es, illa corpus tuum. (cf 2:2.1). T. Schmidt, op.cit pp193 - 248 noted the extensive parallels with Stoic metaphors of the state as a body consisting of independent members. F. Mussner, op.cit pp132 - 40 thinks the metaphor was current in philosophy and rhetoric, where the organization and unity of a city or state were compared to the human body.
72. R. Jewett, op.cit p.229 provides an outline of attempts to find pre-Christian examples.
73. See A. Wikenhauser, Die Kirche als der mystische Leib Christi nach dem Apostel Paulus, Münster, 1949 pp130 - 143.
74. See F. Mussner ibid.
75. Augustine, De Civ Dei 20:9.
76. Percy, Probleme p.285n shows that the ideas in Eph 2:14 - 18 in no way go beyond this OT Jewish concept. 2:16 is from the concept of the Stammvater (p.285) and 18 and 17 from Is 57:19 (p.283). The rest of the thought is from the Pauline tradition. He criticizes Schlier for not comparing Gal 3:28 and Col 3:11 (p.285n). E. Schweizer (TDNT 7:1069 and 1072) believes Paul derived the word from Stoicism, but used it under the influence of Old Testament corporate personality. Cerfaux op.cit p.239 shows that of the four allegories, seed/ground, building (temple) bride and body, the first three are from the Old Testament, the last from Hellenism, but E. Lohmeyer, op.cit (on Col 1:18) shows that in later Judaism, it was not unknown to compare fellowship with the human body.
77. So. - E. Best op.cit p.92.
78. Philo, De Spec Leg 3:23, De Praem et Poen., 19 and 20, Migr Abr, 178.
79. J. J. Meuzelaar op.cit p.170 see note 76.
80. The reverse idea where the human body is depicted as a building is in Qoh 12:3, 4.
81. So Percy/

81. So Percy Probleme p.285.
82. Cf 1.Clem 37:1 - 38:2, 46:5 - 7. Ignatius Smyrna 1:2, Hermas. Parables 9:13.5,7. 9:17.5 and the Apologists, Aristides, Apol 13, Justin. Dial 42:3 (Translations from The Apostolic Fathers by E.J.Goodspeed, New York and London, 1950.)
83. This emphasis on oneness is found in later writers, e.g. Aphraates (Hom 11:16) "Our brothers and members, for we belong to the body of Christ and are members of his members, for who one of these members of Christ's body hates, is separated from his own body and who his own brother hates is separated from the children of God".
84. Ignatius ad Trall 11:2, οὐ δύναται οὐν κεφαλὴ Χρῆς γεννηθῆναι ἄνευ μελῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἔνωσιν ἐπαγγαλλάμενον ὃ ἐστὶν αὐτός
The head cannot be born without parts of the body, since God promises union, which is himself.
85. Ridderbos, op.cit p.383. See H.Schlier pp90 - 96 (excursus on "soma"). E.Best, op.cit p.224 "when we turn to Gnosticism proper with its teaching regarding the heavenly Man, we find that the saved community now comes to be regarded as his body of which Gnostics are members and he is its head". (Cf Exc ex Theod 42.)
86. E.Käsemann, Leib und Leib Christi pp168ff believes the idea of body in Paul is from gnosticism. Paul conceived the oneness of the individual and Christ, like that of the gnostic Ur-anthropos and the individual fragments which are united to him.
More easily acceptable is Käsemann's contrast (184f) between the obedient church as the body of Christ in the new creation and the world in its disobedience belonging to Adam. This can be held without any gnostic presuppositions.
87. See E.Schweizer, Die Kirche als Leib Christi pp163 and 172. He argues that the concept body in the full sense is not found in gnosis. H.M.Schenke op.cit investigates gnostic texts where God is portrayed as a man and concludes that this thought is distinct from the idea of the first man and comes from speculation on Gen 1:26ff, where man is said to be created in the image of God. (See chapter 6 note 80).
88. Fischer, pp58ff thinks the gnostics took over the terminology of the head and infused it with the myth. The various ways in which they use the concepts head, body, members betray that the origin was not in a gnostic myth. Cf K.Koschorke, "Paulus in den Nag-Hammadi Texten", ZTK 78 (1981) 177 - 205.
89. e.g. Angad Rosnan la (Nestorian) "all my members are far away, no more/

more connected, every member of hand and finger" comes from Turfan, China.

90. See articles by H.Schlier (κεφαλή) and K.L.Schmidt (ἐκκλησία) TDNT 3.673 - 82 and 501 - 36 respectively.
91. E.Best op.cit p.86 "It is only in post-Pauline literature that we find the conceptions of human beings as members of the heavenly man (Mandaeism, 2nd century heresies and N.T.Apocryphal literature) in literature affected by Christianity. In the pre-Pauline literature, e.g. Orphism and Indian Mythology, it is the cosmos which is the body of the god and the parts are not men and women but sea, sky, air etc". But Paul could have transferred to the church what others applied to the cosmos.
92. Cf L.Cerfaux, op.cit pp291f. He asks (293) "how could he fail to give an account of the fascination exercised by the atmosphere of gnosticism, when he was at Ephesus".
93. Percy, Leib, p.39 shows the differences.
94. R.Jewett, op.cit pp.284.
95. E.Haupt, Abbott and most commentators. G.B.Winer, A Grammar of New Testament Greek, Edinburgh, 1882 pp435, 6 suggests this points to an ἐν / εἰς interchange.
96. So Gaugler, Barth, E.Schweizer TDNT 7 1077f. H.Ridderbos, op.cit, p.377 n.57 understand a reference to the body of Christ on the cross, Schlier sees the crucified body, but the church is potentially there.
97. Masson.
98. Ambrosiaster, Oecumenius, Holtzmann, E.F.Scott, Abbott, S.Hanson, op.cit pp144 - 6 and Masson. J.J.Meuzelaar op.cit p.40 believes that Paul utilized the metaphor "the body of Christ" for the practical purpose of urging the unity of Jew and Gentile in the church (e.g. 1.Cor 10:16). But this theme is not so clear outside of Ephesians.
99. Dibelius, Schlier.
100. It is strange that "in Christ" in Ephesians is alleged not to have the mystical connotation it has in Paul, yet at the same time Ephesians is said to use "body" mystically whereas Paul does not. Percy Leib, esp pp 32, 37, 43 is at least consistent in finding the same mystical outlook in Ephesians as in Paul.
101. Theodoret has "one spirit to God". Olshausen says that the united Christ of the church bears in himself soma and pneuma.
102. Eadie.
103. Harless is wrong in relegating this to an unimportant position. The law did cause a barrier between Jew and Gentile as well as hostility against God/

against God.

104. P.Benoit, "Conspectus biblici de Ecclesia ei Mundo", Angelicum, 43 (1966) 311 - 20 says the function of the church as Christ's body is to bring all creation to serve God. This process continues from the resurrection of Christ until the end of the world.
105. "The cross" is frequently found in the suggested hymns, Col 1:20, 2:14, Heb 12:2, Phil 2:8. The gnostics used the cross as an illustration of separation. The Valentinians saw the horizontal bar as the limit between the upper and the lower world, over which Christ reaches out to the lower Sophia. The vertical bar divides between the right and left areas of the world, that is between pneumatics and psychics. (The cross was understood as T shaped.) See H.Jonas, The Gnostic religion, Boston, 1958, p.186n.
106. So J.Gnilka, Die Zeit Jesus p.205.
107. 1.Cor 1:23 Christ did not come as a superman (Rom 8:3 - 4) but under the law to fulfil its requirements, "made sin" "made a curse". The word cross is used in Gal 3:1, 5:11, 6:12, 14, 1.Cor 1:13, 23, 2:2, 8, Phil 2:8, 3:18, Col 1:20, 2:14. Cf the gospel accounts, Acts 2:36, 4:10, Heb 12:2.
108. See Section 3.1.4 (especially notes 34, 35). "The Binding of Isaac" (The Akedah) which seems a possible type of the sacrifice of Christ (Heb 11:17 - 20, James 2:21 - 23, Rom 8:32) does not probably antedate Christianity, see H.J.Schoeps, Paul, London, 1961, pp147ff. Recent studies include P.R.Davies, "Martyrdom and Redemption on the development of Isaac Typology in the early church" (Paper given at the Oxford Patristic Congress, September 1979) and B.D.Chilton, "Isaac and the second night. A consideration" Biblica 61 (1980) 78-88.
109. B.F.Westcott sees Christ using the cross as an altar. Cf Heb 13:10, 9:14. "In him, humanity bore the doom of sin and the power of sin was abolished."
110. See H.G.Meecham, op.cit p.564.
111. So Beet, cf Col 1:22.
112. But with less emphasis upon the scandal of the cross (Phil 2:8 and 1.Cor 1:21). Cf E.Käsemann, "The Pauline Theology of the Cross", Int 24 (1970) pp151 - 77.
113. So. H.Wiersinga, De Verzoening in de theologische discussie, Kampen 1972.
114. See W.Schmithals, An Introduction to the Theology of R.Eultmann, London 1968, p.187.
115. See S.T.Bloomfield/

115. See S.T.Bloomfield, op.cit, ad loc.
116. H.C.G.Moule, op.cit ad loc.
117. Westcott.
118. So Meyer, Acts 25:13 is the only certain NT example.
119. As suggested by Michaelis, Koppe and Holzhausen (cited disapprovingly by Meyer).
120. So Bleek. Haupt argues that because enmity is placed alongside the concept of "reconciled to God" it can only refer to the relationship with God.
121. This is the view of Bengel, Beza, Ruckhardt, Meier and Harless (cited Bleek). SB suggest by the examples which they give (Gen R 66 (42b), b Pesiq 7a) that this is the interpretation they follow, since this is the only interpretation which they illustrate. Gaugler shows that the difference on hostility from v.14 is not so wide as might seem to be the case. Both have links with the law. One is the outworking of the law, the other is what the law heightened. The abolition of one makes possible the abolition of the other.
122. So Schlatter. R.Scott says Paul uses enmity between Jew and Gentile to illustrate the profound moral alienation of man from God.
123. Meyer.
124. Calvin sees two senses. Either "Christ by his death has reconciled the father to us and taken away his anger" or "by redeeming both Jews and Gentiles alike, he has brought them into one flock". Calvin prefers the latter. The former would be better in New Testament language which teaches that Christ's death has reconciled us to the father, not the Father to us. But concerning Calvin's two views, there is no need of an either-or.
125. E.Käsemann, Perspectives on Paul p.43. Käsemann however says that although originally talked about in relation to the whole world, Paul crystallizes and relates it more strictly to the church and individual Christians. The opposite view is taken by T.W.Manson, op.cit pp50ff. Cf Käsemann in Zeit und Geschichte, (R.Dultmann Festschrift, 1964) pp47 - 59.
126. So Scott and Eadie. The Syriac omits it entirely, translating by the Syriac equivalent of "by his cross has slain the enmity". B.F.Westcott stresses the significance of the double construction "through the cross" and "in him". In the former, the cross is the instrument of Christ and in the second the vehicle of his activity in which he is present.
127. Robinson shows that "thereby" is a possible translation, but "himself" is favoured/

is favoured by αὐτός in 14 and ἐν αὐτῇ . "Thereby" would be impossible if "through the cross" goes with ἀποκτείνας .

Gnilka p.144 thinks in the hymn it was a reference to the Universal Man but for our author it is the crucified body of Christ. Barth prefers (p.298) but says we cannot really choose between them dogmatically. Hodge translates as "by it". R.Schnackenburg op.cit acknowledges that most relate it to the cross. But the identical expression in v.15 shows it is not his person as such, but the crucified body of Christ.

128. Alford cites F, al lat mss in Jerome, ff. See Vulgate and Gpc.
129. Masson, Haupt and Schlatter. Ewald thinks the stress of our letter and the use of ἐν in the securing of all salvation through Christ, means it is not to be simply attached to reconcile, but as "in him" he gave even himself on the cross.
130. e.g. Gal 5:17 and Rom 7:14 - 25 (although possibly a pre-Christian experience of Paul or autobiographical of every man). R.Jewett op.cit p.146 sees the law abiding Jew in the old aeon, condemned by the righteousness of God, revealed in the new aeon.

NOTES FOR CHAPTER EIGHT

1. Cf Schenkel.
2. Hodge connects with the whole of 14 - 16 "Christ having effected peace, announced it". Bengel shows that purification precedes promulgation.
3. Cited Irenaeus, A.H.1.4.5. Irenaeus and Epiphanius give great detail of the understanding of pleroma by Valentins and his disciple Ptolemaeus. See Foerster, 1.121ff and P.D.Overfield, op.cit.
4. R.Bultmann pioneered the understanding of Paul's Christology from gnosticism rather than in the dying and rising god of the Mystery Religions. He taught that gnostics in Paul's time had the myth of the "redeemed redeemer", i.e. the redeemer who descended into the domain of the power of the enemy, assuming human form and has himself to be redeemed. (op.cit 1.pp130, 166ff, 175ff.) M.Black op.cit p.177 has shown that whenever in gnostic literature the concept of the redeemer is found, it is not antecedent to Christianity but borrowed from it. But he acknowledges "the ubiquity of the conception in the Middle and further East from the 2nd century AD onwards in so many forms, is difficult to explain as due entirely to Christian influences".
5. M.Barth p.305 says "the pertinent myth includes the salvation of the spirits that were dispersed in the realms of matter and death, by their insertion into the redeemer's body".
6. See C.H.Talbert, "The Myth of a Descending - Ascending Redeemer in Mediterranean Antiquity", NTS 22 (1975 - 6) 418 - 39. He gives details of ascending persons who are not redeemers in What is a Gospel? pp26ff.
7. Cf K.M.Fischer p.132.
8. See Ovid, Met, 8:626 - 721. Tacitus Hist, 4:83 - 4. C.H.Talbert, op.cit p54ff. The victorious descent of the Saviour-god into the underworld is found in near eastern religion from Egypt to Mesopotamia (e.g. in the Songs of Tammuz, Sanders pp111, 112).
The Greek heroes are "pictured as having visited Hades in their lifetime perhaps just to give their deceased ancestors a change".
(K.S.Latourette op.cit p.319). See J.D.Turner, "The Gnostic Threefold Path to Enlightenment", Nov.T.22 (1980) 324 - 51 for Greek and Jewish antecedents. See also G.W.MacRae, "The Jewish Background of the Sophia Myth", Nov T 12 (1970) 36 - 101 and F.M.Yamauchi, "The Descent of Ishtar, the Fall of Sophia and the Jewish roots of Gnosticism", TB 29 (1978) 143 - 75.
9. J.Danielou, The Theology of Jewish Christianity, London 1964, pp206ff.
10. Schlier/

10. Schlier, CK pp17f.
11. Ellicott.
12. Fischer, p.131 finds evidence here for a worked over hymn. Ewald gets over chronological difficulties by translating "then even he is the peace for us, who having made the two one ... etc and having come, preached peace ..."
13. Cf John 10:16 (Eadie).
14. Eadie criticised Raphelius, Grotius and Koppe for this view.
15. Cf Rabbinical exegesis of the rock following Israel through the wilderness, quenching their thirst at every stage. Tosephta Sukka 3:11. See A.T.Hanson, Jesus Christ in the Old Testament, London, 1965. Cf the Theophanies in Gen 18:22f, Jos 5:13ff and Judges 13:21.
16. For this viewpoint see R.T.France in New Testament Interpretation, ed H.L.Marshall, Exeter 1977 p.272.
17. Mt 4:17, Mk 1:38, Lk 4:43, John 4:4 - 42, Acts 10:36 - 7, Heb 2:3, Barn 5:8.
18. The understanding of "came" as a reference to his bodily advent on earth has been very popular. Meyer cites Chrysostom, Anselm, Estius, Holzhausen, Matthias, Harless. Gaugler cites Hofmann, Wohlenberg and Belser.
While J.Jeremias, Die Briefe an Timotheus und Titus, Göttingen 1947 pp20 - 22 may argue Jesus only preached to Jews. By the time Ephesians was written, he may have been believed to have exercised some ministry to non-Jews.
19. Mitton and W.Hendriksen ad loc, think it probably refers to all of Christ's work on earth. Cf John 14:12, Acts 1:1f, 4:10, 30, Mt 9:13, Lk 19:10, 1.Tim 1:12.
F.Schille p.30, like Hendriksen, says the preaching is first by Christ then by the apostles. The hymnody later has an interest in the earthly life of Jesus (cf Heb 5:7 - 10 and Barn 5:6 - 10 which traces Jesus' teaching to his earthly work). Eph 2:14 - 17 is more like 1.Cor 15:3-5.
20. So Turner. This sense of the word "come" is in Mt 11:18, 19, John 9:39 1.Cor 2:1.
21. Monod cites Olshausen as suggesting that such a scrupulous respect for chronological order was not in the thought of the Apostle.
22. Lk 24:36, John 20:19, 21:14, Eph 1:20, 1, "It is the risen Jesus who came and preached, not an absentee landlord" (Caird).
23. Bengel says it is not the resurrection itself, since that was a going out of/

out of the world, but his personal preaching after his resurrection. R.Penna, Paix, 108 shows a reference to the earthly Jesus is not likely, since Paul does not pay much attention to the pre-paschal Jesus.

24. C.Hodge links with the continuing work of Jesus "the annunciation of the favour of God made by Christ, his reappearing at the resurrection, which was temporarily in person and continuous in his spirit". We notice that Heb 7:1 - 3 reserves the title "king of peace" for the exalted king and high priest. Bengel understands ἐλθὼν as being his coming from death and from his descent into hell ("veniens a morte, profectione ad inferos, resurrectione victor laetus ipse ultro muntiavit" cited Abbott). He is supported by J.O.Murray op.cit, ad loc, who noticing the aorist, suggests it refers to a period now closed and means the resurrection appearances.
25. Schlier p.137 cites Haupt, Rendtorff, Staab, Friedrich, (TDNT) Käsemann. M.Barth compares the High Priest coming out after the sacrifice and giving his Aaronitic blessing of peace.
26. Preaching in the Spirit is the view of Meyer, Bleek and Beck (cited Schlier), Klopper, Olshausen, Salmond, Stoeckhardt and Zerwick. Meyer has a list and discussion of those holding opposing view points. It is not possible to distinguish between preaching in the spirit and preaching through the apostles.
27. Bleek.
28. Meyer says it was the view of most in his time, although many would link with Christ's life as well.
29. H.Schlier p.137, argues that the earthly ministry of Jesus plays no role in the hymn. The coming refers to the ascended Christ. He compares with 1.Tim 3:16 (so does J.Jeremias op.cit ad loc). Schlier in his more recent Der Geist und die Kirche, shows that the peace of God reaches us, as it is preached to us through the Holy Spirit, p.124, cf p.183. Gnllka believes the coming refers to Christ's exaltation. Dahl, Kurze p.36, thinks it is not exclusively his preaching on earth, or his appearance to his disciples. It is the entire office and preaching of the Gospel.
30. Cf Haupt, "What Christ did in his life and then in his death". Monod understood preaching before his death and after his resurrection (John 14:27 John 20:21, 26). Masson sees incarnation, his earthly ministry and post-Easter proclamation. Cf G.Friedrich, (article εὐαγγελίσονται TDNT 2:718. His manifestation, not merely his preaching, but his whole work is/

work is described in terms of *εὐαγγελίζεσθαι*) and J.Schneider (article *ἔρχομαι* TDNT 2:674, who shows that the only Pauline references to Christ's first coming in contrast to his eschatological coming are 1.Tim 1:15 and Eph 2:17).

31. Cf Acts 10:36, 1.Cor 5:18 - 20 (cited Foulkes). Dahl, Kurze, p.36 shares the same sentiments and cites the same passages, connecting with Is 52:7 and 57:19. F.W.Grosheide, Die Brief van Paulus Aan de Efeziërs, Kampen 1960 ad loc, likewise thinks it is best understood of the whole work of Christ upon earth, which was for the good of the Gentiles. (Cf Matt 11:18, 19, 9:13, Lk 19:10, 1.Tim 1:15).
32. Cf Gaugler p.118.
33. D.Seccombe shows that although Isaiah is not the only O.T. book to use the term for preaching, it is the only book which employs it in a significant theological manner (p.254). Cf P.Stuhlmacher, Das paulinische Evangelium, Göttingen, 1968 1 pp233f.
34. See Bengel, p.79. Cf the singular "fruit" in Gal 5:22.
35. Masson p.167. W.M.L.de Wette, Kurze Erklärung der Brief an die Kolosser, Philemon, Epheser, Philipper. Leipzig 1847 ad loc, thinks it is to make it more emphatic. R.Stier, Die Gemeinde in Christo Jesu: Auslegung des Briefes an die Epheser, Berlin 1848, ad loc, sees an interpolation from Is 57, weakening the sense and marring the unity. Such a conclusion would only be warranted, if the present text did not have a possible interpretation.
36. So Meyer cf John 14:27.
37. M.Barth p.266n "To say peace, peace, when there is no peace, is according to Jer 6:14 and Ezek 13:10, a travesty of the priestly and prophetic offices".
38. Col 3:11 places Greeks before Jews.
39. J.Strachan, The Captivity and the Pastoral Epistles, London 1910 ad loc "to sin is to go into the far country, to repent is to come near the Father's house".
40. So Lindemann, p.177f. Cf Dibelius p.69 and Gaugler p.119.
41. Dibelius thinks the double shalom in Isaiah is to show that the "near" as well as the "far" need the preaching. R.P.Martin, "N.T.Theology" Exp T 91 (1979-80) 368 believes Isaiah is peshered to reverse its O.T. and Rabbinic meaning.
42. See ch.3 note 121. Midrash Esther 3:9 says "no nation is near to God, except Israel". See also J.J.Meuzelaar op.cit p.60ff.
43. R.N.Whybray, Isaiah 40 - 66 London 1975.
44. See *ibid*/

44. See *ibid* for details.
45. Cf The Old Testament use of "mouth" "lips" and "the arm of the Lord" etc.
46. The R.S.V. translates shalom in 2.Sam 18:28 as "all is well".
47. Lamadrid 2:114 says peace is a term which fittingly expresses the content of the biblical covenant. Ex 34:25, 37:26 and Is 54:10.
48. G.A.Smith, Isaiah, London n.d. ad loc.
49. D.R.Jones, Isaiah II and III in the New Peake's Commentary ad loc.
50. C.Westerman, Isaiah 40 - 66, London 1969 ad loc. Eph 4:14 recalls Is 57:20.
51. Lamadrid 2:130 says Trito-Isaiah presents the conversion of the nations as a participation in the cult of the temple at Jerusalem. Is 56:6 - 7 60:7, cf Hag 2:7 - 9. Is 45:14 is inspired by 18:7.
52. Zerwick p.63. G.Fohrer, Das Buch Jesaja 32 Zurich and Stuttgart 1964 p.205 cf Dan 9:7⁰ and Esther 9:10. Schlier p.121.
53. Mek.Ex.18:6, Gen.R.84:4, Ab 1:12, Josephus BJ 7:33, Philo, De Spec Leg 1:51. H.Sahlin, Die Beschneidung Christi, Symbolae Biblicae Upsalienses, Lund.12, 1950, thinks all the Jewish terms in Eph 2, such as commonwealth of Israel, near, far etc must be understood as referring only to the real Israel. Cf S.Hanson op.cit p.142. Sahlin's work is perhaps the most detailed interpretation of Eph 2:11 - 22.in relation to Jewish proselyte practice (so Rader op.cit p.189).
54. There are passages in the Qumran texts in which the thought of the community is linked with the concept of coming near to God (1QS 11:13 1QH 14:13f).
 Later Rabbinical interpretation of Is 57:19 identifies "far" with those smitten with leprosy (Lev.R.16(116d) cf SB 4:751. M.Grant, Paul p.149 says Judaism's history had always "struck an uneasy balance between the tribal and the universal", they were the chosen people and yet God was for everyone.
55. Cf Hippolytus 5:7 on the Ophites, *παῦς παῦς τὴν ἀσυμφωνίαν τοῦ κόσμου καὶ ποιήσων εἰρήνην τοῖς μακρὰν τούτέστι τοῖς ἑλικοῖς καὶ χοῖκοῖς καὶ εἰρήνην τοῖς ἐγγύς τούτέστι τοῖς πνευματικοῖς καὶ νεκροῖς τελείοις ἀνθρώποις*
56. B.Rigaux, op.cit pp123ff. E.E.Ellis, Paul's use of the Old Testament, London, 1957 pp11ff lists 93 including 4 in Ephesians and 2 in the Pastorals.
57. E.Ellis *ibid* p.83. R.E.Clements, Old Testament Theology. A Fresh Approach, London 1978, thinks the New Testament way of interpreting the Old Testament did not originate in New Testament times but goes back to/

back to the time, when the Old Testament was in the process of being formed. See R.N.Longenecker "Can we reproduce the exegesis of the New Testament?" Tyndale Bulletin 21 (1970) 3 - 38 esp 16ff. M.V.Fox "The Identification of Quotations in Biblical Literature", ZAW 92 (1980) 416 - 31 shows that the recognition of quotations is important in exegesis. But the hypothesis if applied without controls can lead to the exegete's imposition of his presuppositions on the texts. Two types of quotation must be distinguished. There are words taken from another source and used as the speaker's words and words meant to be understood as belonging to a person other than the primary speaker. See M.D.Hooker "Beyond the things that are written"; St Paul's use of Scripture", NTS 27 (1980 - 1) 295 - 309.

58. See Ewald p.133 and M.Barth p.276. He "used only fragments of Is 57:19 and added new words to the quotation. He probably assumed that such changes would offer an authentic interpretation of the prophetic text".
59. We have scriptural exegesis by a Christian. See Stuhlmacher, "Er ist unser Friede" p.347. Percy, Probleme, p.283. Conzelmann op.cit pp68f. Deichgräber op.cit p.167 n.1. F.Mussner, op.cit pp100f. F.Festorazzi op.cit p.165. Stuhlmacher believes a Rabbinical method has inspired this exegesis in 2:13ff.
60. Turner compares Acts 2:39. Not until the great sheet of Acts 10:11 did Peter envisage Gentiles.
61. F.Delitzsch, 2:354.
62. Kirby pp157. Gnllka p.25 speaks of Kirby's fanciful exegesis at one's convenience. See Section 3.2.6.
63. Stuhlmacher op.cit p.347f. F.Mussner op.cit p.96 says an OT rabbinic background is as probable as a gnostic one.
64. S.B.III, 9f 587.
65. Paul in Romans frequently uses Isaiah, e.g.3:15 - 17, 9:20, 27 - 29, 10:11, 21, 11:26, 34, 14:11, 15:21. Isaiah was a popular book among N.T. authors. T.Holz, Untersuchungen über die alttestamentlich zitate bei Lukas, Berlin 1968, finds that Luke had significant access to Isaiah.
66. Schlier does not accept, as Chrysostom, Kloppner Haupt and Rendtorff do, that ὁτι is the contents of the preaching. He accepts it as causal (cfH von Soden, Staab and Dibelius).
67. Schille, pp.29, 30 regards "access" in 1.Pet 3:18 as hymnic.
68. So Lindemann p.179.
69. C.C.Caragounis op.cit p.71
70. Lamadrid 2:pp111f.
71. Lindemann/

71. Lindemann p.178. The myth is historicised. H.Schlier sees a throne scene like 1.En 47:3ff. Heb 2:9f, 4:14ff, 6:19f, 9:11ff, 24, 10:5ff, 19ff.
72. M.Barth, pp298ff and 312.
73. "To the Father" (in Phil 2:11, Col 1:12, Eph 1:3) is often regarded as hymnic.
74. Ewald thinks it is not Trinitarian but means the God-given spirit in which the two as one come to the Father.
75. Lamadrid p.244.
76. As W.Nauck op.cit.
77. Barth thinks it possibly means two groups, but it is unlikely.
78. J.J.Meuzelaar op.cit p.63 shows this is a concept in Hellenistic Judaism.
79. Homer. Od.8.543 and 546 = ξεινός
80. A.N.Sherwin-White, Roman Society and Roman Law in the New Testament. Oxford 1963, p.185 says πολιτεία is used of metropolitan cities, such as Alexandria and Seleucia, to denote self-sufficient and self-governing communities of non-citizens, especially of Jews, who form a city within a city.
81. J.J.Meuzelaar op.cit p.61.
82. I.Epstein op.cit p.141 says Israel's missionary task was solely to replace pagan laws by Noachian ones. Israel later left this task to Christians and to Islam (p.144). There were seven Noachian precepts, abstention from idolatry, blasphemy, incest, murder, theft, eating the limb torn from a living animal, plus the administration of justice.
83. W.D.Davies, p.63 shows how the Rabbis "oscillated between a desire to keep off proselytes with one arm and the desire to draw them with the other".
84. MkiIla Nezikim 18 (on Ex 20:20ff) Eccles R cn1:8.
85. J.F.Crouch op.cit pp90f and J.J.Meuzelaar op.cit pp61f.
86. J.F.Crouch, ibid. The writer of Ephesians being fond of synonyms, is unlikely to wish to distinguish the strangers and sojourners as two different groups.
87. P.Minear, Images of the Church in the New Testament, Philadelphia, 1960 pp173 - 222 enumerates close to 100 images.
Building is a wide metaphor, suggesting the tower of Babel, the Jerusalem temple, David's house (i.e. descendants, 2.Sam 7) Herod's Temple as well as Qumran and Gnostic ideas. See H.Schlier. CK ch.5. "Der Leib Christi als himmlischer Bau".
88. F.Mussner op.cit pp101f thinks it is inspired through Is 56:5.
R.J.McKelvey/

R.J.McKelvey, The New Temple, Oxford, 1969 pp118 - 20 by the world shrine of Isaiah and Intertestamental thought, esp Enoch 90:29 - 34. Lamadrid 1.255 shows that the Qumran community is described as an edifice, temple, an eternal plantation in 1QS 5:5 - 6, 8:4 - 10, 9:3 - 6, 11:8, 1QH 6:25-28 4QM 40pIsa^d frag 1. F.Best, The Miracles in Mark, Rev Exp 75 (1978) 539 - 554, p.543 finds the promise of a new temple, a church which comes into being with Jesus resurrection, in 14:58 and 15:29. The fig tree withers and because the Jews have failed a new temple is created for the Gentiles. 11:17 (p.544). J.F. A.Sawyer op.cit p.58 claims that this attitude to the Temple is the dominant one in Biblical tradition from Moses' reconstruction of a spiritual sanctuary in the wilderness (Ex 25 - 30) and Ezekiel's idealized temple vision to John's (Rev 21 and 22), cf Is 6 and Paul (2.Cor 5).

J.Szlaga, "Zbudowani na fundamencie apostołów i provoków. Problemy egzegetyczne. Ef 2:19 - 22" Coll. Theol. 46 (1976) 46 - 65 (see NTA 21 (1977) 176) suggests Paul obtained the metaphors from the intertestamental environment, based on the post-exilic prophets who saw a new temple and a new covenant would emerge, through the spiritual transformation of the Jewish people. The prophets still took the temple very literally (e.g. Ezekiel 40 - 48 and Zech 14). It was Christ who made the real transformation possible.

89. C.C.Caragounis op.cit p.72.

90. Like Romans 1:2.

91. M.Barth and J.Jeremias, Der Eckstein, Angelos, 1 (1925) 65 - 70 TDNT 1:791 - 3 and 4:274 - 5 understand it as the keystone. See R.J.McKelvey "Christ the Cornerstone", NTS 8 (1961 - 2) 352 - 9 and Rader op.cit pp55f. H.Merklein, Amt pp144f has detailed discussion on the cornerstone in Eph 2, and concludes that J.J. has not proved that outside of Is 28:26 it only means keystone. It is possibly the keystone in Ephesians, because of the book's reference to the head. See Schnackenburg op.cit p.676.

1.Pet 2:6 is a foundation stone, but when connected with Ps118:22 in 1.Pet 2:7, Acts 4:11 and Mt 21:42 it would be connected with the idea of a keystone or a stone at the top corner of a building, which held the whole together. But in our passage there is no contrast between Christ as the foundation and Christ as the head.

92. Lamadrid, 1:253.

93. There/

93. There appears to have been a wide use in the early church of a small selection of OT texts. For discussion of the "Testimonies" see F.C.Burkitt, The Gospel History and its Transmission Edinburgh 1906, p.126. J.R.Harris, Testimonies, 2 vols, Cambridge 1916 and 1920. C.H.Dodd, According to the Scriptures, New York, 1953 pp28 - 60 suggested whole passages from which texts came rather than a collection of isolated texts. Cf E.E.Ellis, op.cit pp98ff. F.V.Filson, op.cit p.327 finds a small group of Messianic Scripture passages from the Dead Sea furnishing a precedent for such a practice. See J.M.Allegro, "Further Messianic References in Qumran Literature", JBL 85 (1956) 174 - 187, esp 182-187 = Deut 5:28f, 18:18ff, Num 24:15 - 17, Deut 33:8 - 11 and Josh 6:26. R.Hodgson Jr, "The Testimony Hypothesis" JBL 98 (1979) 361 - 78 shows how the publication of 4QTest + 4QFlor has revived interest in the older understanding of testimonies. Instances of collections abound in Greek, Roman, Jewish, Christian writings from 4th century BC to the 4th century AD (p.363).
94. R.J.McKelvey, The New Temple, pp118 - 20 understands a Jewish background (Isaiah and Intertestamental) for these building images.
95. H.Merklein, Ant p.124 Apart from Calvin, it is only recently that scholars have seen a reference to Old Testament Prophets, e.g. F.Mussner op.cit p.108. We have a contrast to the imagery of the broken wall by speaking of building the walls of the new temple.
96. Qumran details which relate to this are found in J.Coppens, "Le 'Mystère' dans la theologie paulinienne et ses paralleles qumraniens", Recherches Bibliques, 5 (1960) 142 - 165, F.Mussner, "Contributions made by Qumran to the understanding of the Epistle to the Ephesians", in Paul and Qumran pp159 - 78. Penna Proiezione, 174 and Merklein Ant 118-158. P.Johnson, A History of Christianity, London 1978, p.17 says "the mere act of dislocation to the desert implied that the presence of God was no longer bound to the physical Temple in Jerusalem".
97. For details of views on the new Temple see R.J.McKelvey op.cit pp114f (dealing with Ephesians). Schlier sees a gnostic background, but McKelvey the same Jewish milieu as in the earlier epistles. He receives support from B.Gärtner, op.cit who argues that both temple and body symbolism are from a Palestinian rather than an Hellenistic background. E.P.Clowney, "The Final Temple" WTJ 35 (1973) 156 - 79 emphasizes that it is not the absence of the idol but the presence of the Lord that distinguishes Israel's worship. Jesus' death opened the way for Gentiles to be a person not a place.
98. E.Best/

98. E. Best op.cit p.160 shows that body is linked with a building in Job 4:19 and Philo De Praem et Poen 20.
99. See H. Ridderbos, op.cit p.432.
100. Ἐν πνεύματι may belong either to τοῦ θεοῦ or ὑμεῖς, συνοικοδορεῖσθε or εἰς κατοικήτηριον and still have this meaning. (Cf Abbott, "He by his spirit or in his spirit, dwells in this temple"). Robinson p.162 thinks that the "one spirit" is ultimately indistinguishable from the personal Holy Spirit", just as "one body" is indistinguishable from the body of Christ, but we could not in either case substitute one term for the other, without obscuring the Apostle's meaning". We reply that the spirit might be indistinguishable from the Holy Spirit, but in 2:16 there is a clear distinction between Christ and the body he creates.

NOTES FOR CHAPTER NINE

1. P.Stuhlmacher op.cit esp pp346-348 = Judges 6:24, A Jewish Method is used in 1:22, 4:8ff, 5:31f. (F. Hussner, Christus, das all und die Kirche pp94 - 6, thinks that Gentile salvation is only understandable against the background of Isaiah. Cf J.J.Meuzelaar op.cit pp60ff and H.Sahlin op.cit. Sahlin differs in saying that all the Jewish terms such as "the commonwealth of Israel", "near", "far" refer to the true Israel the church.

Lamadrid 1:258 sees the liturgy of the initiation of the proselytes (SB 3:585-7). Eph 2:17 is not a direct quotation, hence the 3rd edition of the United Bible Societies Greek New Testament, 1975 no longer has it in the bold type of previous editions. R.Penna op.cit p.163 shows the manner in which Ephesians cites the Old Testament without a formula of introduction.

2. See chapter 3, note 124. Perrot goes too far. How can this be proved or disproved?
3. I.Epstein op.cit pp114f. J.D.G.Dunn op.cit pp82ff, cf E.E.Ellis op.cit pp39ff. For a definition of Midrash see R.Le Déaut, "Apropos a definition of Midrash", Int 25 (1971) 259-82 and A.G.Wright, "The Literary Genre Midrash", CBQ 28 (1966) 105-38 and 417-57. R.T.France, "The Formula-Quotations of Mt 2 and the problem of communication", NTS 27 (1980-1) 233-251 says (p.235) there is an interent danger in applying to the Gospels terms such as midrash, haggadah or pesher (even if these in themselves admitted of clear definition and were universally understood in the same sense). He cites H.Palmer, "Just married I cannot come" Nov T 18 (1976) 241-257 "The complexity of allusion intelligible to a modern scholar with lots of books and little else to do is much greater than that accessible to any Jewish audience". (257)

France insists the evangelists did not sit down with the O.T. before them like Qumran scholars. They rather drew freely from the whole corpus of O.T. literature whatever seemed to them to be suitable texts to illustrate the account of Jesus.

Would the approach be any different for the author of Ephesians?

4. Dunn op.cit pp88f and 92 gives examples. Rom 10:6-9 (the clearest) 9:7ff, 1.Cor 15:54-56, 2.Cor 6:2, Eph 4:8-11, Heb 2:6-9, 3:7-19, Gal 3:16. R.W.Thurston, "Midrash and Magnet Words in the New Testament", EQ 51 (1979) 22-39 gives other examples including 1.Cor 1:18-24, 9:8-12, 10:1-13, 2.Cor 3:7-8, Gal 4:21-31. For an example of gnostic interpretation/

interpretation of the O.T. see B.A. Pearson, "Gnostic Interpretation of the O.T. in the Testimony of Truth (NHC 9:3)", HTR (1980) 299-310. The Gnostics did not necessarily reject the O.T. Foerster's Anthology refers to 17 books. The Testimony of Truth has one short quotation or allusion, two extended Midrashim and three allegories: Ephesians is nearer the first.

5. Note the Testimonies. See Chapter Eight, note 93.
6. P. Stuhlmacher op.cit p.30.
7. See W.S. Campbell, "Romans 3 as a key to the structure and thought of the letter", Nov T 23 (1981) 22-40, esp. p.25. See Chapter Two, note 71.
8. See Chapter Two, note 273.
9. So P. Althaus in Mysterium Christi, ed G.K.A. Bell and A. Deissmann, London, 1930, p.195.
10. G. Bornkamm, Paul, London 1975, p.141.
11. G.E. Ladd, A Theology of the New Testament, London, pp450ff. R. Bultmann, The Theology of the New Testament, 1.285. W. Kümmel, The Theology of the New Testament, London, 1972, p.203.
12. D.E.H. Whiteley, see note 3.35 of this thesis.
13. D.G. Guthrie, A New Testament Theology, Leicester, 1981, p.490.
14. R.P. Martin, Exp.T 91 (1979/80) 364-8.
15. J.P. Sampley, Ephesians, Philadelphia 1978 thinks it is a development or adaptation of Pauline themes to a later situation. R.P. Martin in "Reconciliation and forgiveness in Colossians" in Reconciliation and Hope, ed R.J. Danks, Exeter, 1974, 104-124 thinks that "blood of Christ" in Col 1:20 is a Pauline addition to an original hymn which conceived of reconciliation in terms of a cosmic theology.
16. R.P. Martin, Reconciliation: A study of Paul's Theology, London 1981, only became available in time for this summary. The book has a long chapter on Ephesians which adds many insights and useful studies of issues raised in this thesis. He finds a hymn in Eph 2:14-16 (p.172) and prefers $\mu\epsilon\sigma\acute{o}\tau\omicron\iota\chi\omicron\nu$ to be a reference to the Jewish temple barrier than to a gnostic one.
17. Fischer believes the author of Ephesians is trying to keep the old Pauline church order against the Catholic trend known elsewhere. The signs of this early catholicism are, a) an institutionalised rather than a charismatic church, b) the Parousia is no longer imminent but rather "not yet", c) the faith has been crystallized into set forms. Merklein, Amt p.54 says it was written by a post-Pauline official concerned about theology and tradition. Penna, Proiezione, 165 says the danger/

the danger of internal division was not through external influence but by return to a pre-Christian view.

H.Chadwick, Absicht sees a spiritual crisis of post-Pauline Gentile Christianity which was to be met by emphasis placed upon the unity of the church at a time, when there was not much visible church unity. It attempts to bring the various efforts and results of the Gentile mission under the wing of the unique apostleship of Paul. In "All things to all men", MTS 1 (1954-5) 261-275 esp 270ff, he suggests the writer of Colossians is doing two things at once, acting as apologist for Christianity to intellectual pagans and defending the gospel truth within the church. (But would pagans bother to read it, or be expected to?).

M.Grant, op.cit p.61 suggests that "Paul himself was too towering a figure to be rejected permanently as an arch-heretic". He seemed a failure until the Jewish war made it imperative for Christians to dissociate from every taint of Judaism (189). His Gentile mission became a dominant theme and force once again.

Any of these views are possible, once we are certain that Paul did not write Ephesians, since we then have a free range over a wide area of space and time. If the personal allusions cannot be taken factually, we have no anchor in any specific milieu.

18. N.A.Dahl, Interpreting Ephesians then and now, Theology Digest, St. Louis, 25 (1977) 305-15 and "Currents in Theology and Mission" (St Louis) 5 (1978) 133-43 says Ephesians can be claimed for both early Catholicism and Gnosticism because of the very general and abstract way in which the church is described. E.Schweizer op.cit mediates between those who advocate a gnostic and those who find an OT background.
19. H.Hegemann, Die Vorstellung vom Schöpfungsmittler im hellenistischen Judentum und Urchristentum, Berlin 1961 esp p 145f. He finds examples of it in the use of Ps 68 by Eph 4:8ff. Details can be found in Stuhlmacher p.340 and J.Gnilka p.44.
20. As J.Munck, op.cit.
21. E.Stegemann, "Alt und Neu bei Paulus und in den Deuteropaulinien (Kol/Eph)", Ev.The 37 (1977) 508-36 says Paul's antithesis of old and the new through the Christ event is dissolved in Col/Eph and replaced with spatial categories, NTA 22 (1978) 848.
22. E.Käsemann, Perspectives on Paul, London 1971, pp73-78. G.Bornkamm, Paul, 115ff, 136ff and R.A.Harrisville, Romans, Minneapolis 1980.
23. C.F.Stendahl/

23. Cf. Stendahl. Other possibilities are Christ mysticism (A. Deissmann) and apocalypticism (see J.C. Beker op.cit pp18f, 32f, who says Ephesians is not by Paul since among other things it is not apocalyptic).

C.H. Dodd could accept Pauline authorship for Ephesians because he believed Paul moved away from his earlier apocalypticism.

- Abbott, T.K. Ephesians and Colossians, Edinburgh, 1897.
- Alford. H. The Greek New Testament, vol.3, London, 1862.
- Allan. J.A. The In Christ Formula in Ephesians, NTS 5 (1958-9)54-62, Ephesians, London, 1959.
- Archer. R.L. The Epistolary Form in the New Testament, Exp.T.63, (1951-2) 296-298.
- Aus. R.D. Paul's travel plans to Spain and the 'Full number of the Gentiles' of Rome 11:25, Nov.T.21, (1979) 252-268.
- Barclay. W. The Mind of St Paul, London and Glasgow, 1958.
- Barrett.C.K. Pauline Controversies of the Post-Pauline Period, NTS20 (1973-4) 229-45.
John, London, 1978.
- Barth. M. The Broken Wall, Chicago, 1959.
Israel and the Church in Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians, Int. 17 (1963) 3-24.
Was Paul an Anti-Semite? JEcSt.5 (1968) 78-104.
Ephesians, New York, 1974.
- Batey. R. The Destination of Ephesians, JBL 82 (1963) 101.
- Bauer. W. Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity, London, 1972.
- Baulés. R. L'insondable richesse du Christ, Paris. 1971.
- Beare. F.W. Ephesians, The Interpreters Bible X, New York. 1953.597-749.
- Beck. J.T. Erklärung des Briefes Pauli an die Epheser, Gütersloh. 1892.
- Beet. J.A. A commentary on St Paul's Epistles to Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians and to Philemon. London. 1890.
- Bengel. J.A. Gnomon, English Edition, Edinburgh, 1858.
- Benoit. P. Corps, tête et plérôme dans les Epîtres de la Captivité RB 63 (1956) 5-44.
L'Hymne Christologique de Col.1:15-20, in, Christianity, Judaism and other Greco-Roman Cults, Studies for Morton Smith at 60. Part 1. N.T.Leiden 1975. 226-263.
- Best. E. One Body in Christ, London. 1955.
Eph.1:1, in, Text and Interpretation : Studies in the New Testament presented to Matthew Black, ed E.Best and R.McI.Wilson, Cambridge, 1979.
- Betz. O. The Eschatological Interpretation of the Sinai Tradition in Qumran and in the New Testament, RQ 6(1967-9)89-107.
- Bickerman.E.J. The warning Inscription of Herod's Temple, JQR 37(1946-7) 387-405.
- Black. M. The Pauline Doctrine of the Second Adam, SJT 71(1954)170-9.

- Bleek. F. Vorlesungen über die Briefe an die Kolosser, den Philemon und die Ephesier, Berlin, 1865.
- Bloomfield, S.T. The Greek Testament with English Notes, 3rd ed. vol. 2. London, 1839.
- Bornkamm. C. Paul, London, 1971.
- Borsch. F.H. The Son of Man in Myth and History, London, 1967.
- Bousset. W. Kyrios Christos, New York, 1970 (1913).
- Bowman. J.W. The Epistle to the Ephesians, Int. 8. (1954) 188-205.
- Brandenburger, E. Frieden im Neuen Testament, Gütersloh, 1973.
- Bruce. F.F. Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts, The Hague, 1959.
Paul and Jesus, Grand Rapids, 1974.
Paul and the Law of Moses, BJRL 57 (1974-5) 259-79.
Ephesians, London, 1961.
The Spreading Flame, Exeter, 1958.
Paul, Apostle of the Free Spirit, Exeter, 1977.
- Bultmann. R. The Theology of the New Testament, vol. 1, London, 1952.
- Caird. G.B. Paul's Letters from Prison, Oxford, 1976.
- Calvin. J. Ephesians. (1548) Trans by TIL Parker, Edinburgh, 1965.
The Institutes of the Christian Religion, 1559.
- Campbell. W.S. Romans 3, as a Key to the structure and thought of the letter, Nov. T., 23 (1981) 22-40.
- Candlish. J.S. Ephesians, Edinburgh, 1895.
- Caragounis. C.C. The Ephesian Mysterion, Meaning and Content, Lund, 1977.
- Catchpole. D.R. The Problem of the Historicity of the Sanhedrin Trial, In, The Trial of Jesus, ed. E. Bammel, London, 1970.
- Cerfaux. L. The Church in the Theology of Paul, New York, 1959.
- Chadwick. H. Die Absicht des Epheserbriefes, ZNW 51 (1960) 145-53.
The Early Church, London, 1967.
- Charles. R.H. The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. in English, Oxford, 1913.
- Charlesworth. J. The Odes of Solomon-not Gnostic. CBQ 31 (1969) 357-69.
The SNTS Pseudepigrapha Seminars at Tübingen and Paris on the Books of Enoch. NTS 25 (1978-9) 315-23.
- Childs. B.S. Exodus, London, 1974.
- Church. F.F. Rhetorical Structure and Design in Paul's Letter to Philemon. HTR 71 (1978) 17-33.
- Clark. K.W. The Gentle Dias and other essays, Selected by J.L. Sharpe III Leiden, 1980.
- Coggan. F.D. A note on Eph 2:14, Exp. T. 53 (1941/2) 242.
- Collins. J.J. The Mythology of Holy War in Daniel and the Qumran War Scroll, VT. 25 (1975) 596-612.

- Colpe. C. Die religionsgeschichte Schule, Göttingen. 1961.
- Colwell. A. A definite rule for the use of the article in the Greek New Testament, JBL. 52 (1933) 12-21.
- Conzelmann.H. Der Brief an die Epheser, Göttingen, 1976.
- Coutts. J. Eph 1:3-14 and 1.Pet 1:3-12, NTS 3(1956/7) 115-127.
The Relationship of Ephesians and Colossians NTS 4 (1957-8) 201-7.
- Craigie. P.C. Yahweh is a Man of War, SJT 22 (1969) 183-8.
- Cross. F.L.ed.Studies in Ephesians, London, 1956.
- Crouch. J.E. The Origin and Intention of the Colossian Haustafel, Göttingen, 1972.
- Dahl. N.A. Adresse und Prömium des Epheserbriefes, TZ 7 (1951) 241-64,
et al Kurze Auslegung des Epheserbriefes, Göttingen, 1965.
- Daines. B. Paul's use of the Analogy of the Body of Christ - with special reference to 1.Cor 12. EQ 50 (1978) 71-8.
- Dale. R.W. Lectures on Ephesians, London, 1900.
- Daniel. J.L. Anti-Semitism in the Hellenistic-Roman Period, JBL 98 (1979) 45-65.
- Danby H. ed The Mishnah, Oxford, 1933.
- Davies. P.R. 1QM. The War Scroll from Qumran. Its structure and history, Rome, 1977.
The Aqedah. A revised tradition history, CBQ 40 (1978) 514-46.
- Davies. W.D. Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, 3rd ed, London 1970
Paul and the People of Israel, NTS 24(1977-8)4-39.
and D.Daube,eds, The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology, Cambridge. 1956.
- de Boer. M.C. Images of Paul in the Post-Apostolic Period CBQ 42 (1980) 359-80.
- Deichgräber.R. Gotteshymnus und Christushymnus in der frühen Christenheit, Untersuchungen zu Form, Sprache un Stil der fruhchristlichen Hymnen, Göttingen. 1967.
- Deissmann. A. Paul. A Study in Social and Religious History, London, 1912.
- de Jonge.M.and van der Woude.A.S. 11QMelch and the New Testament, NTS 12 (1965-6) 301-26.
- De Lange.N.R.M. Origen and the Jews, Cambridge, 1976.
- de Vaux. R. The Early History of Israel, London, 1978.
- Dibelius. M. Epheser, Tübingen, 1953.
- Dodd C.H. The Bible and the Greeks, London, 1935.
The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel.Cambridge.1953.

- Doty W.G. The Classification of Epistolary Literature, CBQ 31 (1969) 185-99.
Letters in Primitive Christianity, Philadelphia, 1973.
- Drane. J.W. Paul. Libertine or Legalist? A study in the theology of the Major Pauline Epistles, London, 1975.
- Duncan. G.S. St Paul's Ephesian Ministry, London, 1929.
- Dunn. J.D.G. Unity and Diversity in the New Testament, London, 1977.
- Eadie. J.A. A Commentary on the Greek Text of Ephesians, New York, 1861, (1854).
- Edersheim. A. The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah, London, 1900 (2 vols).
The Temple, London, 1959.
- Ellicott. C.J. St. Paul's Letter to the Ephesians, London. 1883.
- Ellis. E.E. Paul's Use of the Old Testament, London, 1957.
and M. Wilcox, ed. Neotestamentica et Semitica, Edinburgh, 1969.
- Epstein I. Judaism, London, 1953.
ed, The Babylonian Talmud, London. 1935ff.
- Ewald. P. Epheser, Kolosser und Philemonbrief ausgelegt, Leipzig, 1910.
- Filson. F.V. A New Testament History, London, 1965.
- Fischer. J.A. Pauline Literary Forms and Thought Patterns, CBQ 39 (1977) 209-33.
- Fischer. K.M. Tendenz und Absicht des Epheserbriefes, Göttingen, 1973.
- Fitzmyer. J.A. Some Notes on Aramaic Epistolography, JBL 93 (1974) 201-25.
Reconciliation in Pauline Theology, in, No Famine in the Land, ed. J.W. Flanagan and A.W. Robinson, Missoula, 1975, pp 155-77.
- Foerster. W. Gnosis. A selection of Gnostic Texts, E.T. ed by Mcl. Wilson, Oxford, 1972. and 1974.
- Fohrer. G. Introduction to the Old Testament, London, 1970.
- Ford. J.M. Zealotism and the Lukan Infancy Narratives, Nov. Test, 18 (1976) 280-92.
- Foulkes. F. The epistle of Paul to the Ephesians, London, 1963.
- Fox. M.V. The identification of Quotations in Biblical Literature, ZAW 92 (1980) 416-31.
- Fraser. J.W. Jesus and Paul, Abingdon, 1975.
- Fung. R.Y.K. Some Pauline Pictures of the Church, EQ 53 (1981) 89-107.
- Furnish. V.P. The Love Command in the New Testament, London, 1973.
- Gamble. H. The Redaction of the Pauline Letters and the formation of the Pauline Corpus, JBL 94 (1975) 403-18.
- Gärtner. B. The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament, Cambridge, 1965.

- Gaugler. E. Epheserbrief, Zurich. 1966.
- Giavanni. G. La Structure Littéraire d'Eph 2:11-22, NTS 16 (1969-70) 209-11.
- Gill. A. Note upon Eph 2:14, Exp.T.2 (1890-1) 93.
- Gillett. D. Shalom:Content for a Slogan, Themelios,1(1976)80-84.
- Gnilka. J. Der Epheserbrief, Freiburg. 1971.
Christus unter Friede-ein Friedens-Erlöserlied in Eph 2:14-17 in Die Zeit Jesu (Festschrift for H.Schlier) 190-207, Freiburg, 1970.
- Goguel. M. Esquisse d'une solution nouvelle du problème de l'épître aux Ephésiens. Revue D'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses, Strasbourg, 111 (1935) 254-284 and 112(1936) 73-99.
- Goodspeed.E.J. The Apostolic Fathers, London. 1950.
- Goppelt. L. Christologie und Ethik, Göttingen. 1968.
- Gordis. R. Increasing Peace in the World, A note on a Talmudic Passage, JQR 67 (1976-7) 44-6.
- Gore. C. Ephesians, A Practical Exposition, London, 1898.
- Grant. M. Nero, London, 1970.
The Jews in the Roman World, Bungay. 1973.
- Grant. R.M. A Historical Introduction to the New Testament,London and Glasgow, 1971.
- Grassi. J.A. Ephesians, in the Jerome Biblical Commentary ed.Brown, Fitzmyer and Murphy, London, 1969.
- Grosheide.F.W. Die Brief van Paulus Aan de Efesiërs, Kampen, 1960.
- Gundry. R.H. Soma in Biblical Theology, Cambridge, 1976.
- Hagner.D.A. and Harris M.J. Eds. Pauline Studies, Exeter, 1980.
- Hanson. A.T. The Wrath of the Lamb, London, 1957.
Jesus Christ in the Old Testament, London, 1965.
Studies in Paul's Technique and Theology, Grand Rapids. 1974.
- Harless.G.C.A. Commentar über den Brief Pauli an die Efeser, Erlangen 1834.
- Harvey. A.E. The Use of Mystery Language in the Bible, JTS n.s.81 (1980) 320-36.
- Haupt. E. Die Gefangenschaftsbrieife, Göttingen, 1902.
- Hayes. J.H. and Miller.J.M. Israelite and Judaeen History, London.1978.
- HendriksenW. Ephesians, London, 1972.
- Hengel. M. Judaism and Hellenism, London, 1974.
- Hodge. C. Ephesians, London, 1856.

- Holtzmann, H.J. Kritik der Epheser-und Kolosserbriefe, Leipzig, 1872.
- Hooker. M. Were there false teachers at Colosse? In Christ and Spirit in the New Testament, (C.F.D. Moule Festschrift) ed. B. Lindars and S.S. Smalley, Cambridge, 1973.
- Houlden, J.L. Philippians, Colossians, Philemon and Ephesians, London 1970.
- Howard. G. The Head/Body Metaphors of Ephesians, NTS 20 (1973/4) 350-6.
- Hübner. H. Das Gesetz bei Paulus, Göttingen, 1978.
- Hunter. A.M. The Fifth Evangelist, London, 1980.
- Jacobson, D.M. Paul and his Predecessors. London. 1940. (Rev 1961).
- Jacobson, D.M. Ideas concerning the plan of Herod's Temple, PEQ 112 (1980) 38-40.
- Jay. E.G. The Church, its changing image through 20 centuries vol.1, London, 1977.
- Jayne. D. We and You in Eph 1:3-14, Exp.T. 85(1973-4)151-2.
- Jeremias. J. The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, London, 1966.
- Jeremias. J. Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus, London, 1969.
- Jewett. R. Paul's Anthropological Terms, A Study of their use in Conflict Settings, Leiden, 1971.
- Johnson. P. A History of Christianity, London, 1978.
- Kaiser. O. Introduction to the Old Testament, Oxford, 1975.
- Käsemann. E. Epheserbrief. in RGG 3rd.ed. 1958 II 517 -20.
- Käsemann. E. Das Interpretationsproblem des Epheserbriefes, ThLZ 86 (1961) 1-8. reprinted in Exegetische Versuch und Besinnungen 2 (1964) 253-61, Göttingen.
- Käsemann. E. Essays on New Testament Themes, London, 1964.
- Käsemann. E. Ephesians and Acts in L.E. Keck and J.L. Martyn ed. Studies in Luke-Acts, Nashville, 1966.
- Käsemann. E. Perspectives on Paul, London, 1971 (German 1969).
- Käsemann. E. Jesus Means Freedom, London, 1969.
- Käsemann. E. The Pauline Theology of the Cross, Int.24(1970)151-77.
- Kearns. C. The Church the body of Christ according to St. Paul, IER 90 (1958) 145-57. 91 (1959) 1-15, 313-27.
- Kirby. J.C. Ephesians: Baptism and Pentecost, London, 1968.
- Klassen. W. A Child of Peace (Luke 10:6) in First Century Context NTS 27 (1980-1) 488-506.
- Klemm. M. ΕΙΡΗΝΗ im neutestamentlichen Sprachsystem, Bonn, 1977.
- Kribb. M.A. The Date of the Parables of Enoch, A Critical Review, NTS 25 (1978-9) 345-59.

- Knox. W.L. St Paul and the Church of the Gentiles, Cambridge, 1939
Parallels to New Testament use of Soma, JTS 39(1938)243-6.
- Lamadrid.A.G. Ipse est pax nostra, Estudios Biblicos.28(1969)209-61,
29(1970)101-36 and 227-66.
- Latourette.K.S. A history of the expansion of Christianity, Exeter, 1970.
- Lightfoot.J.B. Colossians and Philemon, Grand Rapids. 1957 (1879).
- Lindemann.A. Die Aufhebung der Zeit, Gütersloh, 1975.
Bemerkungen zu den Adressaten und zum Anlass der
Epheserbrief, ZNW 67 (1976) 235-51.
- Lloyd-Jones.D.M. God's Way of Reconciliation, Edinburgh, 1972.
- Lohmeyer. E. Die Brief an die Philipper an die Kolosser und an
Philemon, Göttingen. 1930.
- Lohse. E. Colossians and Philemon, Philadelphia. 1971.
The New Testament Environment, London, 1976.
- Longenecker.R.N. Can we reproduce the exegesis of the New Testament?
Tyndale Bulletin 21 (1970) 3-38.
- Lorenzi L.de ed. Paul de Tarse, Apôtre du notre temps, Rome. 1979.
- Lyall. F. Legal Metaphors in the Epistles, TB 32(1981)81-95.
- McKay. J.A. God's Order, New York and London, 1953.
- McKelvey.R.J. Christ the Cornerstone, NTS 8 (1961-2) 352-9.
The New Temple, Oxford, 1969.
- McCown. W. The Hymnic Structure of Col.1:15-20 EQ51(1979)156-62.
- McNamara. M. The New Testament and the Palestinian Targum to the
Pentateuch, Rome, 1978.
- McPherson.J. Commentary on Ephesians, Edinburgh, 1892.
- MacRae. G.W. The Jewish Background of the Sophia Myth, Nov.T 12(1970)
86-101.
- Manson. T.W. On Paul and John, London, 1963.
- Marchant.G.J.C. The Body of Christ, EQ 30(1958)3-17.
- Marshall.I.H. Orthodoxy and Heresy in earlier Christianity, Themelios 2
(1976-7) 5-14.
ed. New Testament Interpretation, Exeter, 1977.
The Significance of Pentecost, SJT 30(1977) 347-69.
- Martin. G.C. Ephesians, Colossians, Philemon and Philippians,
Edinburgh, 1902.
- Martin. R.P. Aspects of Worship in the N.T. Church, VE 1963.6-32.
An early Christian Hymn, (Col 1:15-20) EQ 36(1964)195-205.
Worship in the Early Church, London, 1964.
An Epistle in Search of a Lifesetting, Exp.T.79(1967-8)
296-302.

- Martin. R.P. Colossians and Philemon, London, 1974.
 Reconciliation and Forgiveness in Colossians, In, Reconciliation and Hope, New Testament Essays on Atonement and Eschatology, (L.Morris Festschrift) ed.R.Banks, Exeter. 1974.
 New Testament Foundations, 2. Exeter. 1977.
 New Testament Theology, A Proposal, The Theme of Reconciliation, Exp.T.91(1979-80)364-88.
- Marxsen. W. Introduction to the New Testament, Oxford, 1968.
- Masson. Ch. L'Épître de St Paul aux Ephésiens. Neuchâtel and Paris. 1953.
- Meecham.H.G. Romans 3:25f and 4:25. The meaning of *ἁμάρτια* and the accusative, Exp.T.50 (1938-9) 564.
- Merklein. H. Das Kirchliche Amt nach dem Epheserbrief, Munich, 1973.
 Zur Tradition und Komposition von Eph 2:14-18, Ek (N.F.) 17 (1973) 79-102.
- Metzger.B.M. Index to Periodical Literature of the Apostle Paul, Leiden 1960.
- Meuzelaar.J.J. Der Leib des Messias, Eine exegetische, Studie über den Gedanken vom Leib Christi in den Paulusbriefen, Assen, 1956.
- Meyer.H.A.W. Ephesians and Philemon, Edinburgh, 1884.
- Meyer. R.P. Kirche und Mission im Epheserbrief, Stuttgart, 1977.
- Milik. J.T. The Books of Enoch, Aramaic Fragments of Qumran, Cave 4. Oxford, 1976.
- Millar. F. The background to the Maccabean Revolution, Reflections on Martin Hengel's Judaism and Hellenism, JJS 29 (1978) 1-21.
- Mitton. C.L. The Epistle to the Ephesians, Oxford, 1951.
 Ephesians, London, 1976.
- Moffatt. J. An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament. Edinburgh, 1918.
- Monod. A. Explication de l'Épître de St Paul aux Éphésiens, Paris, 1867.
- Moore. G.F. Judaism, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1927.
- Morris. L. The Apostolic Preaching of the Cross, London, 1955.
- Moule.C.F.D. The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Colossians and Philemon, Cambridge, 1957.
 An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek, Cambridge, 1959.
- Moule.H.C.G. Ephesians, Cambridge, 1899.
- Munck. J. Paul and the Salvation of Mankind, Chatham, 1959.

- Murphy-O'Connor, J. ed, Paul and Qumran, London, 1968.
- Murray, J.O.F. Ephesians, Cambridge, 1914.
- O'Brien, P.T. Eph 1: An unusual introduction to a N.T. Letter. NTS 25 (1978-9) 504-16.
- Olshausen, H. A Biblical Commentary on St Paul's Epistles to Galatians, Ephesians, Colossians and Thessalonians, Edinburgh, 1851.
- Overfield, P.D. Pleroma, A Study in content and context, NTS 25 (1978-9) 384-96.
- Pagels, E.H. The Gnostic Paul, Gnostic Exegesis of the Pauline Letters, Philadelphia, 1975.
- Peake, A.S. A Critical Introduction to the New Testament, London, 1909.
- Pedersen, J. Israel. I, II, Oxford, 1926, III, IV, Oxford, 1947.
- Pelikan, J. The Christian Tradition. vol.1. The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition, 100-600 AD, Chicago, 1971.
- Penna, R. La Proiezione dell Esperienza Comunitaria sul piano Storico (Ef.2:11-22) e Cosmico (Ef.1:20-23), Rivist Bib. 26 (1978) 163-86.
- Percy, E. Der Leib Christi, $\Sigma\acute{\omega}\mu\alpha\ \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon$ in den paulinischen Homologumena und Antilegomena, Lund-Leipzig, 1942.
Die Probleme der Kolosser-und Epheserbriefe, Lund, 1946.
- Perrin, N. The New Testament : An Introduction, New York, 1974.
- Pfleiderer, O. Paulinism, London, 1891.
- Pokorný, P. Epheserbrief und gnostische Mysterien, ZNW 53 (1962), 160-94.
- Pritchard, J.B. ed. Ancient Near Eastern Texts relating to the Old Testament, Princeton, 1969.
- Rader, W. The Church and Racial Hostility, A History of Interpretation of Eph 2:11-22, Tübingen. 1978.
- Ramaroson, I. Une Lecture de Éphésiens 1:15-2:20, Biblica 58(1977) 338-410.
Le Christ, notre paix, Eph 2:14-11 Sci.Esp 31 (1979) 373-82.
- Ridderbos, H. Galatians, Grand Rapids, 1961.
Paul: An Outline of His Theology, Grand Rapids, 1975.
- Rienecker, F. Der Brief des Paulus an die Epheser, Wuppertal, 1968.
- Rigaux, B. Letters of St Paul, Chicago, 1968.
- Robinson, J.A. St Paul's Epistle to Ephesians, 2nd ed. n.d., 1st. ed. 1903.
- Robinson, J.A.T. The Body, London, 1952.
- Robinson, J.M. A formal analysis of Col 1:15-20. JBL.76(1957)270-87.
- Roels, E.D. God's Mission, The Epistle to the Ephesians in Mission Perspective, Laneker, 1962.

- Rogerson, J.W. The Hebrew Concept of Corporate Personality :
A re-examination, JTS.n.s.21(1970)1-16.
- Salmond, S.D.F. The Expositors Greek New Testament, Ephesians, London,
1903.
- Sampley, J.P. And the two shall become one flesh, A Study of
tradition in Eph 5:21-33, Cambridge, 1971.
- Sanders, E.P. Paul and Palestinian Judaism, London, 1977.
- Sanders, J.T. Hymnic Elements in Eph 1-3, ZNW 56 (1965) 214-32.
The New Testament Christological Hymns, Cambridge, 1971.
- Sandmel, S. Anti-Semitism in the New Testament? Philadelphia, 1978.
- Santer, M. The Text of Eph.1:1, MTS 15 (1968-9) 247-8.
- Sawyer, J.F.A. From Moses to Patmos, London, 1977.
- Scharlemann, M.H. The Secret of God's Plan, Studies in Ephesians, Conc.Th.
Monthly.1.40 (1969) 532-44, 2.41 (1970).155-64,
3.338-46, 4.410-420,
- Schenkel, D. Epheser, Philipper und Kolosser, Bielefeld, 1862.
- Schille, G. Frühchristliche Hymnen, Berlin. 1965.
- Schlatter, A. Die Briefe an die Galater, Epheser, Kolosser und
Philemon, Stuttgart. 1963.
- Schlier, H. Christus und die Kirche im Epheserbrief, Tübingen, 1930.
Der Brief an die Epheser, Düsseldorf. 1957. 7th.ed, 1971.
Der Geist und die Kirche, Freiburg, 1980.
- Schmithals, W. Paul and the Gnostics, 1972.
Die Gnosis in Korinth, Eine Untersuchung zu den
Korintherbriefen, Göttingen, 1956.
- Schoeps, H.J. The Sacrifice of Isaac in Paul's Theology, JBL 65 (1946)
385-93.
Paul, London, 1961. (German 1959).
- Schürer, E. The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus
Christ, Edinburgh, 1885, Revised ed, 1973, (vol.1.)
and 1979 (vol.2.).
- Schweitzer, A. The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, London, 1931.
- Schweizer, E. Die Kirche als Leib Christi in den Paulinischen
Homologumene, ThLZ 86(1961) 161-74 . . . in den
paulinischen Antilegomena, 241-56. Reprinted together
in Neotestamentica, Stuttgart and Zurich 1963. 272-316,
The Church as the Missionary Body of Christ, MTS 8(1961-2).
1-11 Neotestamentica, 317-29.
- Scott, R. Eph 2:14. Exp.T.2 (1890-1) 106.
The Pauline Epistles, A Critical Study, Edinburgh. 1909.

- Seccombe, D. Luke and Isaiah, NTS 27(1980-1)232-9.
- Sevenster, J. N. Paul and Seneca, Leiden, 1961.
The roots of pagan anti-Semitism in the Ancient World, Leiden, 1975.
- Sharpe, III, J. L. The second Adam in the Apocalypse of Moses, CBQ 35 (1973) 35-46.
- Shearer, W. C. To whom was the so-called Epistle to the Ephesians actually written? Exp. T. 4 (1892-3) 129.
- Shedd, R. P. Man in Community. A Study of St Paul's application of O.T. and Early Jewish Conceptions of Human Solidarity, London, 1958.
- Sherwin-White, A. N. Roman Society and Roman Law in the New Testament, Oxford, 1963.
- Simpson, E. K. Commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians, London, 1957.
(with F. F. Bruce on Colossians.)
- Smalley, S. S. The Eschatology of Ephesians, EQ 28 (1956) 152-7.
The Johannine Son of Man Sayings, NTS 15 (1968-9) 278-301.
John, Evangelist and Interpreter, Exeter, 1978.
- Smallwood, E. M. The Jews under Roman Rule, Leiden, 1976.
- Smith, D. C. The Two Made One, Some observations on Eph 2:14-18. Ohio, JRS (1973) 34-54.
- Smith, G. V. Paul's use of Ps. 68:18 in Eph 4:8, Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society, 18 (1975) 181-9.
- Snaith, N. Further Note on Eph 2:14, Exp. T. 53 (1941-2) 325-6.
- Soggin, J. A. Introduction to the Old Testament, London, 1976.
- Staab, K. Die Thessalonischen Briefe und die Gefangenschaftsbriege, Regensburg, 1959.
- Stauffer, E. New Testament Theology, London, 1955.
- Stendahl, K. Paul among Jews and Gentiles and other essays, Philadelphia, 1976.
ed. The Scrolls and the New Testament, London, 1958.
- Stewart, J. S. A Man in Christ, London, 1935.
- Stewart, R. A. Judicial Procedure in NT Times, EQ 47(1975) 94-109.
- Stibbs, A. M. The Meaning of the Word Blood in Scripture, London, 1954.
- Stoeckhardt, G. Commentary on St Paul's Letter to the Ephesians, St. Louis, 1952.
- Stott, J. R. W. God's New Society, The Message of Ephesians, Leicester, 1979.
- Strack, H. L. and Billerbeck, P. Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch, Munich, 1922-61.

- Stuhlmacher, P. Er ist unser Friede, in, Neues Testament und Kirche (for R. Schnackenburg) ed. J. Gnllka. 337-58. Freiburg. 1974.
- Sundberg, A. C. Canon Muratori, A 4th century List? HTR 66 (1973) 1-41.
- Sutcliffe, F. F. Hatred at Qumran, RQ 2(1959-60) 345-56.
- Synge, F. C. St Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians, London, 1954.
- Tachau, P. Einst und Jetzt in Neuen Testament, Göttingen. 1972.
- Talbert, C. H. A non-Pauline fragment at Rom 3:24-6? JBL 85 (1966) 287-96.
- The Myth of a descending and ascending Redeemer in Mediterranean Antiquity, NTS 22 (1975-6) 418-39.
- What is a gospel? London, 1978.
- Thompson, G. H. P. Ephesians, Cambridge, 1967.
- Thornton, L. S. The Common Life in the Body of Christ, Westminster, 1942.
- Thurston, R. W. Midrash and Magnet Words in the New Testament, EQ 51 (1979) 22-39.
- Turner, H. E. W. The Patterns of Christian Truth, London, 1954.
- Turner, J. D. The Gnostic Threefold Path to Enlightenment, Nov. T 22 (1980) 324-51.
- Turner, S. H. Ephesians, New York, 1856.
- Vanhoeye, A. L'Épître aux Éphésiens et l'Épître aux Hébreux, Biblica. 59 (1978) 198-230.
- Vermes, G. Baptism and Jewish Exegesis, New Light from Ancient Sources, NTS 4 (1957-8) 308-19.
- Scripture and Tradition, Leiden, 1961.
- The Dead Sea Scrolls in English, London, 1962.
- Vielhauer, P. Geschichte der urchristlichen Literatur, Berlin and New York, 1975.
- von Allmen, D. Pour une Synopse paulinienne, Biblica 57(1976)74-104.
- ed. The Vocabulary of the Bible, London, 1958.
- von Rad, G. Studies in Deuteronomy, London, 1953.
- Wagner, G. Pauline Baptism and the Pagan Mysteries, Edinburgh, 1967.
- Weiss, J. History of Primitive Christianity, London, 1937.
- Wengst, K. Christologische Formeln und Lieder des Urchristentums, Gütersloh, 1972.
- Westcott, B. F. Ephesians, London, 1906.
- Westermann, C. Isaiah 40-66, London, 1969.
- Whitaker, G. H. Ephesians Explained, London, 1892.
- Whiteley, D. E. H. St Paul's Thought on the Atonement, JTS 8 (1957) 240-55.
- The Theology of St Paul, Oxford, 1964.

- Whybray.R.N. Isaiah 40-66, London, 1975.
- Wikenhauser.A. Pauline Mysticism, London, 1960.
- Wilson, G. Ephesians, Edinburgh, 1978.
- Witt. R.E. Isis in the Graeco-Roman World, London, 1971,
- Wuest. K.S. Ephesians and Colossians in the Greek New Testament,
Grand Rapids, 1953.
- Yamauchi. E. Pre-Christian Gnosticism, London, 1973.
Pre-Christian Gnosticism in the Nag Hammadi Texts,
Church History, 48 (1979) 120-41.
- Yates. R. The Powers of Evil in the N.T, EQ 52 (1980) 97-111.
- Zampaglione.G. The Idea of Peace in Antiquity, Notre Dame, Indiana.
1973.
- Zerwick. M. The Epistle to the Ephesians, London, 1969.
- Zimmerli. W. Old Testament Theology in Outline, Atlanta and Edinburgh
1978.
- Zuntz. G. The Text of the Epistles, London, 1953.